

CONFIRMATIONS

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 22
(legislative day of Mar. 13), 1935*

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

Rear Admiral Adolphus Andrews to be Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral.

Capt. Harold G. Bowen to be Engineer in Chief and Chief of the Bureau of Engineering, Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral.

Herbert B. Riebe to be captain.

Thaddeus A. Thomson, Jr., to be captain.

Albert H. Rooks to be commander.

Floyd J. Nuber to be lieutenant commander.

Joseph A. Farrell, Jr., to be lieutenant.

George L. Purmort to be lieutenant.

Frederick B. Warder to be lieutenant.

Waldo Tullsen to be lieutenant.

Anthony L. Rorschach to be lieutenant.

William B. Colborn to be lieutenant.

Ernest St. C. von Kleeck, Jr., to be lieutenant.

Jackson S. Champlin to be lieutenant.

Clarence C. Ray to be lieutenant.

Roger B. Nickerson to be lieutenant.

Joseph W. Ludewig to be lieutenant.

Thomas J. Greene to be lieutenant (junior grade).

Walter C. Bailey to be lieutenant (junior grade).

Edward H. Allen to be lieutenant (junior grade).

Charles F. House to be paymaster.

John Ball to be paymaster.

Joseph G. Hagstrom to be paymaster.

Patrick J. Byrne to be chief boatswain.

Edward S. Pelling to be chief electrician.

Arthur C. Larsen to be chief pay clerk.

POSTMASTERS

CONNECTICUT

Agnes Reilly Collins, Woodmont.

FLORIDA

Lona F. Baxley, Bay Pines.

Beulah S. Hanna, Hastings.

Gertrude Scott, Jacksonville Beach.

Lynn W. Bloom, Lakeland.

William C. Hill, Miami.

Frederick F. Stump, Starke.

IOWA

Carl L. Anderson, Sac City.

KENTUCKY

Nannie G. Woodson, Eddyville.

MAINE

Adelbert L. Mains, Mechanic Falls.

Archie R. King, Saco.

MINNESOTA

Harold E. Otterstein, Amboy.

Joseph L. Zimmerman, Aurora.

William C. Wiench, Bagley.

Nettie Layng, Bruno.

Alvah G. Swindlehurst, Cass Lake.

Otto H. J. Zorn, Danube.

Dennis E. Murphy, Dassel.

Gunstein D. Aakhus, Erskine.

Herman J. Ricker, Freeport.

Donald B. Brower, Kimball.

Robert B. Forrest, Lake Wilson.

Clarence H. Cook, Newfolden.

Virginia B. Flentje, Round Lake.

Herman E. Kent, Sanborn.

Benjamin F. DuBois, Sauk Center.

Henry C. Megrund, Shelly.

Mae A. Lovestrom, Stephen.

Arthur C. Jensen, Winger.

MISSISSIPPI

Nicie R. Evans, Bassfield.

Fred Eugene Brister, Bogue Chitto.

Minnie B. Dubuissou, Long Beach.

Faye V. Peel, Potts Camp.

Erma L. Morris, Seminary.

MISSOURI

Jessalee Nash, Hollister.

NEBRASKA

Jacob Fred Koehler, Fort Crook.

OREGON

John C. Bilyeu, Tigard.

WASHINGTON

Thomas H. Mansfield, Forks.

Walter A. Arend, Friday Harbor.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MARCH 22, 1935

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Spera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed be the name of the Lord. We give ourselves pause to meditate a moment on the mercies of our Heavenly Father and respond to the voice of the human soul. In Thy holy name we would claim our heritage of happiness in a world whose Builder and Maker is God; we rejoice in the blessing of Thy marvelous works. The sun and the star beams shine for us; the tides ebb and flow for us; the fields and the hill-sides will soon be dressed with living green for us; all Thy works shall praise Thy name Hin earth and land and sea! We most humbly acknowledge that we are debtors. We are grateful for the pioneers of thought, for the martyrs to liberty; but infinitely above these we thank Thee for the Prophet of human brotherhood. Through Him we have been crowned with glory and honor. Forbid that we should move in a world so full, so rich, and so wonderful with heavenly blessings and be hard of heart and blind of eye. Inspire us to love life and hold it as a sacred trust. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

WORLD WAR ADJUSTED-SERVICE CERTIFICATES

Mr. CULLEN. Mr. Speaker, there is some confusion in the minds of the Members as to the exact parliamentary situation of this bill and I would suggest that the Chair announce to the House the status of the measure in order that all Members may have a clear understanding of the parliamentary situation.

The SPEAKER. The first vote will be on the engrossment and third reading of the bill. After the third reading the rule makes in order two motions to recommit.

It is the purpose of the Chair under the rule adopted and following the announcement made by the Chairman of the Rules Committee in presenting the rule to recognize the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. VINSON], or some other gentleman to offer a motion to recommit carrying the so-called "Vinson bill."

After this motion is voted up or down the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], the ranking minority Member of the Ways and Means Committee, if the gentleman seeks recognition to offer such motion to recommit as he may desire to submit.

The first vote after the third reading of the bill will be on the motion which the Chair understands will be offered recommitting the bill with instructions to report the so-called "Vinson bill" back to the House.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Except insofar as the rules respecting the making of motions to recommit are changed by the spe-

cial rule itself, I understand the general rules of the House respecting motions to recommit still apply insofar as they are not changed by the special rule itself?

The SPEAKER. That is true.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, did I hear the Chair announce that after the motions to recommit have been voted upon there will be opportunity to have a roll call upon the final passage of the bill?

The SPEAKER. Yes; if the House so orders. The final vote will be on the passage of the bill. It is within the power of the House to order a roll call if it so desires.

Mr. BLANTON. The final vote may be a roll call or not, as the House may order.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. I was referring to a "yea and nay" vote.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the request of the gentleman?

Mr. KENNEY. I desire to make an announcement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I object. I think there will be time enough to make announcements hereafter.

WORLD WAR ADJUSTED-SERVICE CERTIFICATES

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed, read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill (H. R. 3896) to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause in the said bill and insert the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. BLANTON and Mr. RANKIN reserved all points of order against the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky moves to recommit the bill, H. R. 3896, to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause in said bill and insert the following:

"That notwithstanding the provisions of the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 38, ch. 11; U. S. C., Supp. VII, title 38, ch. 11), the adjusted-service certificates issued under the authority of such act are hereby declared to be immediately payable. Payments on account of such certificates shall be made in the manner hereafter provided in this act upon application therefor to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, and upon the surrender of the certificates and all rights thereunder (with or without the consent of the beneficiaries thereof). The payment in each case shall be in an amount equal to the face value of the certificate, except that if, at the time of application for payment under this act, the principal with respect to any loan upon any such certificate has not been paid in full by the veteran (whether or not the loan has matured), then, the Administrator shall (1) pay or discharge such unpaid principal in such amount as is necessary to make the certificate available for payment under this act, (2) deduct the same from the amount of the face value of the certificate, and (3) make payment in an amount equal to the difference between the face value of the certificate and the amount so deducted.

SEC. 2. In the case of each and every loan heretofore made pursuant to law by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and/or by any national bank, or any bank or trust company incorporated under the laws of any State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia, upon the security of an adjusted-service certificate, any interest that has been or, in consequence of existing law, would be charged against the face value of such certificate either shall be canceled or not so charged, as the case may be, notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary. Any interest on any such loan payable to any such bank or trust company shall be paid by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

SEC. 3. (a) An application for payment under this act may be made and filed at any time before the maturity of the certificate (1) personally by the veteran, or (2) in case physical or mental incapacity prevents the making or filing of a personal application, then by such representative of the veteran and in such manner as may be by regulations prescribed. An application made by a person other than a representative authorized by such regulations shall be held void.

(b) If the veteran dies after the application is made and before it is filed it may be filed by any person. If the veteran dies after

the application is made it shall be valid if the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs finds that it bears the bona fide signature of the applicant, discloses an intention to claim the benefit of this act on behalf of the veteran, and is filed before the maturity of the certificate, whether or not the veteran is alive at the time it is filed. If the death occurs after the application is made or filed but before the receipt of the payment under this act, payment shall be made to the beneficiary designated.

(c) Where the records of the Veterans' Administration show that an application, disclosing an intention to claim the benefits of this act, has been filed before the maturity of the certificate, and the application cannot be found, such application shall be presumed, in the absence of affirmative evidence to the contrary, to have been valid when originally filed.

(d) If at the time this act takes effect a veteran entitled to receive an adjusted-service certificate has not made application therefor he shall be entitled, upon application made under section 302 of the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, as amended, to receive, at his option, either the certificate under section 501 of this act, as amended, or payment under this act.

SEC. 4. Subdivisions (b) and (c) of section 302, section 311, subdivision (b) of section 312, section 602, and subdivision (b) of section 604 of the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, as amended (U. S. C., Supp. VII, title 38, secs. 612, 621, 622, 662, and 664), are hereby amended, to take effect as of December 31, 1934, by striking out "January 2, 1935", wherever it appears in such subdivisions and sections and inserting in lieu thereof "January 2, 1940."

SEC. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 6. This act may be cited as the "Emergency Adjusted Compensation Act, 1935."

Mr. DIES (interrupting the reading of the motion). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

Mr. BLANTON. It is known as the "Vinson bill."

Mr. DIES. It is the Vinson bill, and we have had it read heretofore.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, that does not do away with the reservations of points of order?

The SPEAKER. No. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose only of getting a ruling from the Chair on the existing parliamentary situation, which is novel in that there has never been a precedent like it before in the whole history of this House, I make the point of order that even though the rule provides for two motions to recommit, they are under and governed by the general rules of the House except insofar as the special rule itself changes the general rules. The rules and precedents of the House provide that where a matter has been voted upon and adopted, not only in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union but also in the House itself after the bill comes back from the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to the House, and the House votes on such substantive proposition in the bill and registers its decision on that proposition, and motion is duly made and carried to reconsider the vote by which the proposition was passed and to lay that motion on the table, you cannot have two votes thereafter in the House on the same identical proposition that has been voted upon once in the House.

In this connection I want to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the Patman amendment was submitted in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union as a substitute for the Vinson bill under the proper rules of the House, by moving to strike out the first paragraph of the Vinson bill and offering the Patman bill as an amendment in the way of a substitute, and then giving notice that in case the amendment were adopted the balance of the Vinson bill would be stricken out on motion.

This procedure was followed under the rules of the House. The notice was given, the Patman bill was adopted as a substitute for the Vinson bill in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union by a teller vote, following which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] moved and by unanimous consent had all the balance of the Vinson bill stricken out.

This action was reported to the House itself as soon as the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union

rose. Then there was a direct vote in the House itself on the Patman amendment, on substituting it for the Vinson bill. The House voted by roll call, and the vote was 202 for the Patman substitute as against 191 for the Vinson bill. And thus the House substituted the Patman bill for the Vinson bill.

Now a motion to recommit, seeking to turn around and switch back the Vinson bill for the Patman bill would undo exactly what the House has already voted. My point of order is this: If the special rule provides to do away with all the rules respecting motions to recommit and if we may have two votes in the House on the identical proposition which has already been decided by the House, then we would be placed in the ridiculous position that after we now vote on the Vinson motion to recommit, to substitute the Vinson bill, which will be the second time the House has voted on it, and if the House should vote against that, which would be the second time the House had voted it down, then somebody else could again offer a motion to recommit, the second such motion under the special rule, to substitute the Vinson bill, and then we would have the ridiculous situation of the House of Representatives voting three different times in the House on the same proposition.

I am not averse to giving our friends who were absent yesterday a chance to vote on the matter of choosing between the Patman bill and the Vinson bill, since there was some understanding between certain of our friends in the House, but I simply want to preserve the orderly procedure of the House and the rules and precedents which have been adopted here and followed for 100 years, and it should be made plain that only under the special rule would it be permitted. I hope the Chair will make that matter very plain, that under no circumstances would it be permitted, were it not for the novel and unprecedented language used in the special rule under which this particular bill is being handled.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to my friend from Mississippi, although I am through with my statement.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Texas to two facts: In the first place, while this rule gives the right to make two motions to recommit, it does not give them the right to make any specific motion.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I think it does; but otherwise not as against the general rules of the House.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand that. Then I want to call attention also to the fact that we not only voted in the House on the Vinson bill, but after that vote was taken a motion to reconsider was offered, and that motion was laid on the table.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes; there was a motion to reconsider the vote by which the Patman amendment was adopted made by my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], and that motion was laid on the table, except for this special rule, would prevent a reconsideration of the matter in the House at this time.

Except for the special rule, there could be only one motion to recommit. And under this special rule it is very clear that there could be a motion to recommit generally, there could be a motion to recommit with instructions to bring in the Andrews bill, or there could be a motion to recommit with instructions to bring in the Cochran bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. And there will be.

Mr. BLANTON. Or there can be a motion to recommit with instructions to bring in the McReynolds bill. Two of these motions would be in order.

I submit the point of order to the Speaker merely to get a ruling, so that it may be made plain that only under this special rule would such action be allowed.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I have concluded. I would rather for the gentleman to secure his own time.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, in order that the RECORD may be clear and that there may be no misunderstanding about the parliamentary situation, I desire to reply and oppose the point of order made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

What the gentleman stated as to two actions by the House, first after having adopted the Patman amendment, then permitting a motion to recommit to revive, as it were, the Vinson bill, is correct under general parliamentary procedure. There is no exact rule of the House covering the situation, but ordinarily a parliamentary body does not take an inconsistent position.

What was provided in the special rule for the consideration of bonus bills may be inconsistent, but it was deliberately provided. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] criticizes the rule permitting this procedure, which he calls ridiculously inconsistent, but this rule, for the first time in the history of the parliamentary procedure of this body, as far as we were able to ascertain, made in order the Patman bill, a bill which had never been reported from any committee of the House. This was therefore the first time any opportunity was ever given, under a rule, for the offering of a substitute which was not germane to the bill reported and which proposed amendment had not been reported by a committee, and I say, respectfully, it does not lie well in the mouths of the advocates of the Patman bill to criticize other provisions of the rule when this House unanimously adopted the rule reported by the Rules Committee, going as far as it did to give the Patman bill every consideration.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. I am perfectly willing for the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. VINSON] to be allowed to make his motion to recommit. I think this is in accordance with our understanding and I have no desire to deprive him of the opportunity, regardless of the rules.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That was the distinct understanding.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. As to its not lying well in the mouths of the Patman bill supporters to raise the point of order, I call the attention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] to the fact that the House itself, by a roll-call vote of 202 for the Patman bill as against 191 for the Vinson bill, expressed its preference for the Patman bill over the Vinson bill, and the will of the House is supreme at all times.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I do not agree with the gentleman in his interpretation of what the vote yesterday meant. I do not believe the vote yesterday was directly on the Vinson bill. I am perfectly neutral in my position as to the two bills.

The rule does not do away with the motion to recommit. It extends it. Truly, as the gentleman from Texas has said, it might be possible, if the Speaker should recognize Members to do so, to have two motions to recommit to restore the Vinson bill, although this is not likely to happen, the Speaker is always so fair.

This entire matter was explained and thoroughly understood, and the entire House must have understood that a motion to recommit and substitute the Vinson bill would be in order, even though the Vinson bill had been disposed of, as it were, in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. CONNERY. Not only that, but even if it were inconsistent, the House supported the rule and adopted it unanimously.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The House unanimously supported the rule which we brought in and made a thorough explanation of the situation. I therefore submit, Mr. Speaker, that the point of order should be overruled.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule. The pending bill is being considered under a special rule which was unanimously adopted by the House before the bill was taken up for consideration.

It is true, as the gentleman from Texas suggests, that under the ordinary rules of the House only one motion to recommit would be in order. However, the Committee on Rules, after a very long and thorough consideration of the question before the House, and after what the Chair understands to be a general understanding among those for and

against either one of the bills, decided in the interest of fairness to propose a rule which permitted two motions to recommit.

While it has no bearing upon the ruling of the Chair, the Chair feels that every Member of the House, without regard to his position on this or any other bill pending, understood at the time the rule was proposed by the Committee on Rules, that it would enable the House to express its will with reference to these two bills. The rule was adopted unanimously, and it provided, "That if the instructions in such motion relate to the payment of World War adjusted-service certificates, they shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding."

Now, in view of the action of the House in adopting the rule, the Chair thinks, notwithstanding the fact that a vote was taken yesterday on the so-called "Patman bill" and a motion to reconsider laid on the table, it is in order to recognize a Member to offer the Vinson bill in a motion to recommit, even though it may involve a vote for the second time on the Patman bill.

The Chair therefore overrules the point of order.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 204, nays 207, answered "present" 5, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 32]

YEAS—204

Allen	Darrow	Kimball	Reed, N. Y.
Andresen	Dear	Kinzer	Reilly
Andrew, Mass.	Dempsey	Kloeb	Rich
Andrews, N. Y.	Ditter	Kopplemann	Richardson
Arends	Dobbins	Lambeth	Robertson
Bacharach	Doughton	Lehlbach	Robison, Ky.
Bacon	Doutrich	Lewis, Colo.	Rogers, Mass.
Barden	Drewry	Lewis, Md.	Romjue
Beiter	Driver	Lord	Russell
Biermann	Duffy, N. Y.	Lucas	Sanders, La.
Blackney	Eaton	Ludlow	Schaefer
Bland	Ekwall	McAndrews	Shanley
Bloom	Engel	McLaughlin	Short
Boehne	Englebright	McLean	Sisson
Boland	Farley	McLeod	Smith, Conn.
Bolton	Fenerty	McMillan	Smith, Va.
Boylan	Flesinger	McReynolds	Smith, W. Va.
Brennan	Flannagan	McSwain	Snell
Brewster	Focht	Maas	Snyder
Brooks	Ford, Miss.	Mapes	Spence
Brown, Mich.	Frey	Marshall	Starnes
Buck	Fuller	Martin, Mass.	Steagall
Buckbee	Gavagan	Mason	Sullivan
Buckley, N. Y.	Gearhart	Mead	Sutphin
Bulwinkle	Gifford	Merritt, Conn.	Taber
Burch	Goodwin	Merritt, N. Y.	Taylor, Tenn.
Burnham	Greever	Michener	Terry
Carden	Gregory	Millard	Thom
Carmichael	Gwynne	Mitchell, Ill.	Thomas
Carter	Halleck	Mitchell, Tenn.	Tinkham
Cary	Hamlin	Montague	Tobey
Casey	Hancock, N. Y.	Mott	Tonry
Cavichia	Harlan	Norton	Treadway
Chandler	Hart	O'Brien	Umstead
Chapman	Harter	O'Connor	Utterback
Christianson	Hartley	O'Day	Vinson, Ga.
Church	Hennings	O'Leary	Vinson, Ky.
Clark, Idaho	Hess	O'Neal	Warren
Clark, N. C.	Higgins, Conn.	Owen	Welch
Cochran	Hill, Ala.	Parks	West
Cole, Md.	Hobbs	Pearson	Whelchel
Cole, N. Y.	Hoffman	Perkins	Whittington
Collins	Hollister	Peterson, Fla.	Wigglesworth
Cooley	Holmes	Peterson, Ga.	Wilcox
Cooper, Ohio	Huddleston	Pettengill	Williams
Cooper, Tenn.	Igoe	Plumley	Wolcott
Cravens	Imhoff	Polk	Wolfenden
Crawford	Jenckes, Ind.	Powers	Woodruff
Crowe	Jenkins, Ohio	Ransley	Woodrum
Culkin	Kee	Reece	Young
Darden	Kenney	Reed, Ill.	The Speaker

NAYS—207

Adair	Caldwell	Cross, Tex.	Duffey, Ohio
Amile	Cannon, Mo.	Crosser, Ohio	Duncan
Arnold	Cannon, Wis.	Cullen	Dunn, Miss.
Ashbrook	Carlson	Cummings	Dunn, Pa.
Ayers	Carpenter	Deen	Eagle
Beam	Cartwright	Delaney	Eckert
Bell	Castellow	Dickstein	Edmiston
Berlin	Celler	Dies	Eicher
Binderup	Citron	Ellenbogen	Evans
Blanton	Coffee	Dirksen	Faddis
Bolleau	Colden	Disney	Ferguson
Brown, Ga.	Colmer	Dockweiler	Fernandez
Brunner	Connery	Dondero	Fitzpatrick
Buchanan	Costello	Dorsey	Fletcher
Buckler, Minn.	Cox	Doxey	Fulmer
Burdick	Crosby	Driscoll	

Gasque	Kleberg	Nichols	Secret
Gassaway	Kniffin	O'Connell	Seger
Gehrman	Knutson	Oliver	Shannon
Gilchrist	Kramer	O'Malley	Sirovich
Gildea	Kvale	Palmisano	Smith, Wash.
Gillette	Lambertson	Parsons	Somers, N. Y.
Gingery	Larrabee	Patman	South
Goldsbrough	Lea, Calif.	Patterson	Stack
Granfield	Lee, Okla.	Patton	Stefan
Gray, Ind.	Lemke	Pfeifer	Stubbs
Gray, Pa.	Lesinski	Pierce	Summers, Tex.
Green	Lloyd	Pittenger	Sweeney
Greenway	Luckey	Quinn	Tarver
Greenwood	Lundeen	Rabaut	Taylor, Colo.
Guyer	McClellan	Ramsay	Taylor, S. C.
Haines	McCormack	Ramspeck	Thomason
Hancock, N. C.	McFarlane	Randolph	Thompson
Healey	McGehee	Rankin	Thurston
Higgins, Mass.	McGrath	Rayburn	Tolan
Hildebrandt	McGroarty	Richards	Truax
Hill, Knute	McKeough	Robinson, Utah	Turner
Hill, Samuel B.	Mahon	Rogers, N. H.	Turpin
Hoeppel	Maloney	Rogers, Okla.	Underwood
Hook	Mansfield	Rudd	Wallgren
Hope	Marcantonio	Ryan	Walter
Houston	Martin, Colo.	Sabath	Wearin
Hull	Massingale	Sadowski	Weaver
Jacobsen	Maverick	Sanders, Tex.	Werner
Johnson, Okla.	May	Sandlin	White
Johnson, Tex.	Miller	Sauthoff	Wilson, La.
Jones	Monaghan	Schneider	Withrow
Keller	Montet	Schuetz	Wolverton
Kelly	Moran	Schulte	Wood
Kennedy, Md.	Moritz	Scott	Zimmerman
Kennedy, N. Y.	Murdock	Scrugham	Zioncheck
Kerr	Nelson	Sears	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—5

Corning	Ford, Calif.	Kocialkowski	Lanham
Daly			

NOT VOTING—16

Bankhead	Dietrich	Johnson, W. Va.	Peyser
Claiborne	Fish	Kahn	Stewart
Crowther	Gambrill	Lamneck	Wadsworth
DeRouen	Griswold	Meeks	Wilson, Pa.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call my name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. BYRNS, and he voted "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Wadsworth (for) with Mr. Stewart (against).
Mr. Wilson of Pennsylvania (for) with Mr. Lamneck (against).
Mr. Fish (for) with Mr. Gambrill (against).
Mr. Crowther (for) with Mr. Griswold (against).
Mr. Meeks (for) with Mr. DeRouen (against).

General pairs:

Mr. Bankhead with Mrs. Kahn.
Mr. Claiborne with Mr. Dietrich.
Mr. Johnson of West Virginia with Mr. Peyser.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I change my vote from "present" to "no."

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I change my vote from "present" to "no."

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to both bills. I do not want to be misunderstood. For that reason, I change my vote from "aye" to "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a recapitulation of the vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the vote is close enough to require a recapitulation, and the Clerk will recapitulate the vote.

The Clerk recapitulated the vote.

On motion of Mr. PATMAN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion to recommit was rejected was laid on the table.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following motion to recommit which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TREADWAY moves to recommit the bill H. R. 3896 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment—

Mr. TREADWAY (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, the motion that I am making is to strike out and insert the so-called "Tydings-Andrews bill." I ask unani-

mous consent that the motion be not read, but that the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That section 507 of the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"All amounts in the fund shall be available for payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of adjusted-service certificates upon their maturity or the prior death of the veteran; for payment under section 502 to banks on account of loans to veterans; for the repayment of loans made by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs out of the United States Government Life Insurance Fund on security of adjusted-service certificates, in which case the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall pay interest to such fund to date of maturity of the loan at the rate such fund is authorized to receive under the provisions of subdivision (m) of section 502, as amended; and for payment by the Secretary of the Treasury to veterans of the amount of the cash payment authorized to be paid by this act upon the surrender of their adjusted-service certificates."

SEC. 2. That title V of the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, as amended, is further amended by adding to the end thereof a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 509. (a) At the option and upon the application of any veteran to whom there has been lawfully issued an adjusted-service certificate under the provisions of this act and upon the complete surrender of such adjusted-service certificate together with all rights and privileges thereunder (with or without the consent of the beneficiary thereof), the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount of the maturity value, shown on the face of the adjusted-service certificate surrendered, discounted (at true discount) to January 1, 1945, at the rate of interest of 3 percent per annum, compounded semiannually, from the 1st day of the January or July (whichever is the earlier date) next succeeding the date of the filing with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of the application, less any indebtedness on account of any loan or loans made thereon under the provisions of this act and interest, if any, accrued to the date of the filing of the application with the Veterans' Administration: *Provided*, That for the purposes of this section, on and after January 1, 1932, the rate of interest charged on loans shall be 3 percent per annum, compounded annually, and any interest charged in excess of this rate shall be accordingly adjusted and taken into consideration in the amount certified.

"(b) No payment shall be made or bonds issued under this section until the certificate is in the possession of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, nor until all obligations for which the certificate was held as security have been paid or otherwise discharged.

"(c) If at the time of application to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for settlement under this section the principal and interest on or in respect of any loan upon the certificate have not been paid in full (whether or not the loan has matured) then the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall (1) pay or otherwise discharge such unpaid principal and so much of the unpaid interest (accrued or to accrue) as is necessary to make the certificate available for payment under this section and (2) deduct from the amount of any settlement the amount of such principal and so much of such interest, if any, as accrued prior to the date of filing of application with the Veterans' Administration to surrender such certificate: *Provided*, That as to loans on adjusted-service certificates, properly made, unpaid and held by a bank upon application for benefits in accordance with provisions of this section the bank holding the note and certificate shall, upon notice from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, present them to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for payment to the bank in full satisfaction of its claim of the amount of unpaid principal and unpaid interest, except that if the bank, after notice of application under this section, fails to present the certificate and note to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs within 15 days after the mailing of the notice so to do, such interest shall be only up to the fifteenth day after the mailing of such notice.

"(d) Upon the filing of an application for benefits under this section the certificate and all rights and privileges thereunder shall be canceled.

"(e) A veteran may receive the benefits of this section by application therefor filed with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs during the lifetime of the veteran. Such application may be made and filed at any time before the maturity of the certificate (1) personally by the veteran or (2) in case physical and mental incapacity prevents the filing of a personal application, then by such representative of the veteran and in such manner as may be by regulations prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. Application made by a person other than a representative authorized by such regulations shall be held void.

"(f) If the veteran dies after the application has been filed, the settlement authorized under provisions of section 509 of this act shall be made to the estate of the veteran.

"(g) Settlements under the provisions of this section shall not be made until 3 months subsequent to the date of its enactment.

"(h) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed, upon receipt from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a

statement in a form to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, to issue, in settlement of the amount certified to be due, negotiable bonds, with coupons attached bearing interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum, payable semiannually, up to the highest multiple of \$50 represented in the amount certified. Such bonds shall be dated from the 1st day of the January or July (whichever is the earlier date) next succeeding the date of the filing with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of the application, and shall be redeemable in lawful money of the United States on January 1, 1945. The difference between the net amount certified as due and the amount represented by the bonds issued shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury by check drawn on the Treasurer of the United States: *Provided*, That for a period of 6 months from the date of issuance no bond issued under the authority of this act shall be negotiable or assignable or used as collateral security for a loan by the person to whom the bond is issued for any consideration less than the amount shown on the face of the bond as the redemption value; and any person or persons entering into any agreement, either on behalf of themselves or others, to procure by purchase, trade, or otherwise any bond in violation of this provision shall be guilty of a fraud and shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both.

"(i) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to redeem from the United States Government Life Insurance Fund all adjusted-service certificates held by that fund on account of loans made thereon, and shall pay to the United States Government Life Insurance Fund the amount of the outstanding liens against such certificates, including all interest due or accrued, together with such amounts as may be due under subdivision (m) of section 502, as amended. The Secretary of the Treasury, in making redemption of adjusted-service certificates from the United States Government Life Insurance Fund, is authorized and directed to make payment therefor by issuing to the United States Government Life Insurance Fund bonds of the United States which shall bear interest at the rate of 4½ percent per annum, and such bonds shall not be callable until the expiration of a period of 10 years from date of issue."

During the reading of the foregoing the following occurred:

Mr. RANKIN (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with, and that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to dispense with the further reading of the motion to recommit, and that it be printed in the RECORD at this point. Is there objection?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the motion to recommit.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 82, nays 319, answering "present" 5, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 33]

YEAS—82

Andrew, Mass.	Drewry	Lehbach	Robertson
Andrews, N. Y.	Duffy, N. Y.	Lewis, Colo.	Rogers, Mass.
Bacon	Eaton	Lewis, Md.	Russell
Biermann	Farley	Lord	Sisson
Bland	Ford, Calif.	McLaughlin	Smith, Conn.
Boehne	Gifford	McLean	Smith, Va.
Bolton	Goodwin	McMillan	Snell
Buck	Hancock, N. Y.	Mapes	Sutphin
Burch	Harlan	Martin, Mass.	Taber
Casey	Harter	Merritt, Conn.	Terry
Cavicchia	Hartley	Millard	Thom
Christianson	Hennings	Montague	Thomas
Cochran	Hess	O'Connor	Tinkham
Cole, N. Y.	Higgins, Conn.	O'Day	Tobey
Cox	Hobbs	Oliver	Treadway
Culkin	Hoffman	O'Neal	Utterback
Darden	Hollister	Perkins	Whittington
Darrow	Holmes	Pettengill	Wigglesworth
Dobbins	Huddleston	Plumley	Woodrum
Doughton	Kopplemann	Reed, N. Y.	
Doutrich	Lambeth	Rich	

NAYS—319

Adair	Ashbrook	Bell	Boileau
Allen	Ayers	Berlin	Boland
Amlie	Bacharach	Binderup	Boylan
Andresen	Barden	Blackney	Brennan
Arends	Beam	Blanton	Brewster
Arnold	Beiter	Bloom	Brooks

Brown, Ga.	Faddis	Lemke	Romjue
Brown, Mich.	Fenerty	Lesinski	Rudd
Brunner	Ferguson	Lloyd	Ryan
Buchanan	Fernandez	Lucas	Sabath
Buckbee	Flesinger	Luckey	Sadowski
Buckler, Minn.	Fitzpatrick	Ludlow	Sanders, La.
Buckley, N. Y.	Flannagan	Lundeen	Sanders, Tex.
Burdick	Fletcher	McAndrews	Sandlin
Burnham	Focht	McClellan	Sauthoff
Caldwell	Ford, Miss.	McCormack	Schaefer
Cannon, Mo.	Frey	McFarlane	Schneider
Cannon, Wis.	Fuller	McGehee	Schuetz
Carden	Fulmer	McGrath	Schulte
Carlson	Gasque	McGroarty	Scott
Carmichael	Gassaway	McKeough	Scrugham
Carpenter	Gavagan	McSwain	Sears
Carter	Gearhart	Maas	Secrest
Cartwright	Gehrmann	Mahon	Seger
Cary	Gilchrist	Maloney	Shanley
Castellow	Gildea	Mansfield	Shannon
Celler	Gillette	Marcantonio	Short
Chapman	Gingery	Marshall	Sirovich
Church	Goldsborough	Martin, Colo.	Smith, Wash.
Citron	Granfield	Mason	Smith, W. Va.
Clark, Idaho	Gray, Ind.	Massingale	Snyder
Clark, N. C.	Gray, Pa.	Maverick	Somers, N. Y.
Coffee	Green	May	South
Colden	Greenway	Mead	Spence
Cole, Md.	Greenwood	Merritt, N. Y.	Stack
Collins	Greever	Michener	Starnes
Colmer	Gregory	Miller	Steagall
Connery	Guyer	Mitchell, Tenn.	Stefan
Cooley	Gwynne	Monaghan	Stubbs
Cooper, Ohio	Haines	Montet	Sullivan
Cooper, Tenn.	Halleck	Moran	Sumners, Tex.
Costello	Hamlin	Moritz	Sweeney
Cravens	Hancock, N. C.	Mott	Tarver
Crawford	Hart	Murdock	Taylor, Colo.
Crosby	Healey	Nelson	Taylor, S. C.
Cross, Tex.	Higgins, Mass.	Nichols	Taylor, Tenn.
Crosser, Ohio	Hildebrandt	Norton	Thomason
Crowe	Hill, Ala.	O'Brien	Thompson
Cullen	Hill, Knute	O'Connell	Thurston
Cummings	Hill, Samuel B.	O'Leary	Tolan
Dear	Hoepfel	O'Malley	Tonry
Deen	Hook	Owen	Truax
Delaney	Hope	Palmisano	Turner
Dempsey	Houston	Parks	Turpin
Dickstein	Hull	Parsons	Umstead
Dies	Imhoff	Patman	Underwood
Dietrich	Jacobsen	Patterson	Vinson, Ga.
Dingell	Jenckes, Ind.	Patton	Vinson, Ky.
Dirksen	Jenkins, Ohio	Pearson	Wallgren
Disney	Johnson, Okla.	Peterson, Fla.	Walter
Ditter	Johnson, Tex.	Peterson, Ga.	Warren
Dockweller	Jones	Pfeifer	Wearin
Dondero	Kee	Pierce	Weaver
Dorsey	Keller	Pittenger	Welch
Doxey	Kelly	Polk	Werner
Driscoll	Kennedy, Md.	Powers	Whelchel
Driver	Kennedy, N. Y.	Quinn	White
Duffey, Ohio	Kenney	Rabaut	Wilcox
Duncan	Kerr	Ramsay	Williams
Dunn, Miss.	Kimball	Ramspeck	Wilson, La.
Dunn, Pa.	Kinzer	Randolph	Withrow
Eagle	Kloebe	Rankin	Wolcott
Eckert	Kniffin	Ransley	Wolfenden
Edmiston	Knutson	Reece	Wolverton
Eicher	Kramer	Reed, Ill.	Wood
Ekwall	Kvale	Richards	Woodruff
Ellenbogen	Lambertson	Robinson, Utah	Young
Engel	Larrabee	Robison, Ky.	Zimmerman
Englebright	Lea, Calif.	Rogers, N. H.	Zioncheck
Evans	Lee, Okla.	Rogers, Okla.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—5

Corning	Kocialkowski	Lanham	Reilly
Daly			

NOT VOTING—25

Bankhead	Gambrill	McLeod	Stewart
Bulwinkle	Griswold	McReynolds	Wadsworth
Chandler	Igoe	Meeks	West
Claiborne	Johnson, W. Va.	Mitchell, Ill.	Wilson, Pa.
Crowther	Kahn	Peyser	
DeRouen	Kleberg	Rayburn	
Fish	Lamneck	Richardson	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Wadsworth (for) with Mr. Stewart (against).
 Mr. Claiborne (for) with Mr. Crowther (against).
 Mr. Fish (for) with Mr. Gambrill (against).
 Mr. Wilson of Pennsylvania (for) with Mr. Griswold (against).
 Mr. West (for) with Mr. Kleberg (against).

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Bankhead with Mrs. Kahn.
 Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. McLeod.
 Mr. Johnson of West Virginia with Mr. Peyser.
 Mr. Rayburn with Mr. Chandler.
 Mr. McReynolds with Mr. Richardson.
 Mr. Meeks with Mr. Lamneck.
 Mr. DeRouen with Mr. Igoe.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion to recommit was rejected was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The question recurs on the passage of the bill.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order at this time to ask unanimous consent to change the title of the bill?

The SPEAKER. That can be done after the bill is finally passed. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. SNELL and Mr. PATMAN demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 319, nays 90, answered "present" 1, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 34]

YEAS—319

Adair	Ditter	Kelly	Ransley
Allen	Dockweller	Kennedy, Md.	Rayburn
Amle	Dondero	Kennedy, N. Y.	Reece
Andresen	Dorsey	Kenney	Reed, Ill.
Arends	Doutrich	Kerr	Richards
Arnold	Doxey	Kimball	Richardson
Ashbrook	Driscoll	Kinzer	Robinson, Utah
Ayers	Driver	Kloebe	Robison, Ky.
Bacharach	Duffey, Ohio	Kniffin	Rogers, N. H.
Barden	Duncan	Knutson	Rogers, Okla.
Beam	Dunn, Miss.	Kramer	Romjue
Beiter	Dunn, Pa.	Kvale	Rudd
Bell	Eagle	Lambertson	Ryan
Berlin	Eckert	Larrabee	Sabath
Binderup	Edmiston	Lee, Okla.	Sadowski
Blackney	Eicher	Lemke	Sanders, La.
Blanton	Ekwall	Lesinski	Sanders, Tex.
Bloom	Ellenbogen	Lloyd	Sandlin
Boileau	Engel	Lucas	Sauthoff
Boland	Englebright	Luckey	Schaefer
Boylan	Evans	Ludlow	Schneider
Brennan	Faddis	Lundeen	Schuetz
Brewster	Farley	McAndrews	Schulte
Brooks	Fenerty	McClellan	Scott
Brown, Ga.	Ferguson	McCormack	Scrugham
Brown, Mich.	Fernandez	McFarlane	Sears
Brunner	Fitzpatrick	McGehee	Secrest
Buckbee	Flannagan	McGrath	Seger
Buckler, Minn.	Fletcher	McGroarty	Shannon
Buckley, N. Y.	Focht	McLeod	Short
Bulwinkle	Ford, Miss.	McSwain	Sirovich
Burdick	Frey	Maas	Smith, Wash.
Burnham	Fuller	Mahon	Smith, W. Va.
Caldwell	Fulmer	Maloney	Snyder
Cannon, Mo.	Gasque	Mansfield	Somers, N. Y.
Cannon, Wis.	Gassaway	Marcantonio	South
Carden	Gavagan	Marshall	Spence
Carlson	Gearhart	Martin, Colo.	Stack
Carmichael	Gehrmann	Mason	Starnes
Carpenter	Gilchrist	Massingale	Steagall
Carter	Gildea	Maverick	Stefan
Cartwright	Gillette	May	Stubbs
Cary	Gingery	Mead	Sullivan
Casey	Goldsborough	Merritt, N. Y.	Sutphin
Castellow	Granfield	Michener	Sweeney
Celler	Gray, Ind.	Miller	Taylor, Colo.
Chandler	Gray, Pa.	Mitchell, Ill.	Taylor, S. C.
Chapman	Green	Mitchell, Tenn.	Taylor, Tenn.
Citron	Greenway	Monaghan	Thomason
Clark, Idaho	Greenwood	Montet	Thompson
Clark, N. C.	Gregory	Moran	Thurston
Coffee	Guyer	Moritz	Tolan
Colden	Gwynne	Mott	Tonry
Cole, Md.	Haines	Murdock	Truax
Collins	Halleck	Nelson	Turner
Colmer	Hancock, N. C.	Nichols	Turpin
Connery	Hart	Norton	Umstead
Cooley	Healey	O'Brien	Underwood
Cooper, Ohio	Hess	O'Leary	Vinson, Ga.
Cooper, Tenn.	Higgins, Mass.	O'Malley	Vinson, Ky.
Costello	Hildebrandt	Owen	Wallgren
Cravens	Hill, Ala.	Palmisano	Walter
Crawford	Hill, Knute	Parks	Warren
Crosby	Hill, Samuel B.	Parsons	Wearin
Cross, Tex.	Hoepfel	Patman	Weaver
Crosser, Ohio	Hoffman	Patterson	Welch
Crowe	Hook	Patton	Werner
Cullen	Hope	Pearson	Whelchel
Cummings	Houston	Peterson, Ga.	White
Daly	Hull	Pfeifer	Williams
Dear	Igoe	Pierce	Wilson, La.
Deen	Imhoff	Pittenger	Withrow
Delaney	Jacobsen	Polk	Wolcott
Dempsey	Jenckes, Ind.	Powers	Wolfenden
Dickstein	Jenkins, Ohio	Quinn	Wolverton
Dies	Johnson, Okla.	Rabaut	Wood
Dietrich	Johnson, Tex.	Ramsay	Woodruff
Dingell	Jones	Ramspeck	Zimmerman
Dirksen	Kee	Randolph	Zioncheck
Disney	Keller	Rankin	

NAYS—90

Andrew, Mass.	Duffy, N. Y.	Lewis, Md.	Russell
Andrews, N. Y.	Eaton	Lord	Shanley
Bacon	Fiesinger	McLaughlin	Sisson
Biermann	Ford, Calif.	McLean	Smith, Conn.
Bland	Gifford	McMillan	Smith, Va.
Boehne	Goodwin	McReynolds	Snell
Bolton	Greever	Mapes	Taber
Buchanan	Hancock, N. Y.	Merritt, Conn.	Tarver
Buck	Harlan	Millard	Terry
Burch	Harter	O'Connell	Thom
Caviechia	Hartley	O'Connor	Thomas
Christianson	Hennings	O'Day	Tinkham
Church	Higgins, Conn.	Oliver	Tobey
Cochran	Hobbs	O'Neal	Treadway
Cole, N. Y.	Hollister	Perkins	Utterback
Corning	Huddleston	Peterson, Fla.	Whittington
Cox	Kocialkowski	Pettengill	Wigglesworth
Culkin	Kopplemann	Plumley	Wilcox
Darden	Lambeth	Reed, N. Y.	Woodrum
Darrow	Lanham	Reilly	Young
Dobbins	Lea, Calif.	Rich	The Speaker
Doughton	Lehlbach	Robertson	
Drewry	Lewis, Colo.	Rogers, Mass.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Sumners, Tex.

NOT VOTING—22

Bankhead	Griswold	Lamneck	Stewart
Clalborne	Hamlin	McKeough	Wadsworth
Crowther	Holmes	Martin, Mass.	West
DeRouen	Johnson, W. Va.	Meeks	Wilson, Pa.
Fish	Kahn	Montague	
Gambrill	Kieberg	Peyser	

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call my name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. BYRNS, and he voted "nay."

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Lamneck (for) with Mr. Clalborne (against).
 Mr. Stewart (for) with Mr. Wadsworth (against).
 Mr. Crowther (for) with Mr. Wilson of Pennsylvania (against).
 Mr. Kleberg (for) with Mr. West (against).
 Mr. Griswold (for) with Mr. Sumners of Texas (against).
 Mr. Gambrill (for) with Mr. Montague (against).
 Mr. Meeks (for) with Mr. Fish (against).

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Bankhead with Mrs. Kahn.
 Mr. DeRouen with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
 Mr. Carden with Mr. Peyser.
 Mr. McKeough with Mr. Holmes.

Mr. TINKHAM changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. KNUTSON changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I was temporarily absent and did not answer. If I had been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Speaker, I was outside the Chamber and did not vote. If present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I voted "no." I am paired with the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. GRISWOLD, who voted "aye." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. JOHNSON, of West Virginia, is absent on account of illness. He advises me that, while he favored the Vinson bill, had he been present on this occasion he would have voted for the measure just passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed and lay that on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to change the title, which I am sending to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PATMAN moves to amend the title by striking out the title and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "To provide for the immediate payment to veterans of the face value of their adjusted-service certificates, for controlled expansion of the currency, to extend the time for filing applications for benefits under the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, and for other purposes."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days within which to extend their remarks on this legislation.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this permission was granted day before yesterday at the request of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. PATMAN. That was permission only for those who spoke on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOBBINS. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. MEEKS, is unfortunately absent because of illness. He has asked me to announce that, had he been present yesterday, he would have voted against the amendment of the Vinson bill by the substitution of the Patman bill; that he would have voted today for the motion to recommit and substitute the Vinson bill, and would have voted in favor of the final passage of the bill in its final form.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a point of order with respect to the present parliamentary situation of one part of the bill, and in connection therewith I ask permission of the Chair to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. On yesterday, after the first section of the Vinson bill was read, as shown on page 4216, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] moved to strike out the first section and to insert his own bill as a substitute therefor, giving the usual notice that, in case his amendment carried, he would move to strike out the remaining sections of the Vinson bill.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. I am making the point of order now.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I am making a point of order to the gentleman's point of order. My point of order is that the bill to which the gentleman's motion applies has been concluded and is history.

Mr. BLANTON. In connection with my point of order, I am asking the Chair a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the point of order of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the Chair will find on this page 4216 of the RECORD for yesterday that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] moved to strike out the first section of the Vinson bill and offered his bill as an amendment in the way of a substitute, giving proper notice that if his amendment were adopted he would thereafter move to strike out all the remaining paragraphs of the Vinson bill. Nothing was said about striking out the preamble of the bill which preceded the first section, and it was not stricken out, although the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] objected to the reading of the preamble.

The procedure I have outlined was followed. After the substitute of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], was voted upon and adopted by teller vote in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, as shown on page 4231 of the RECORD, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], asked unanimous consent that the remaining sections of the Vinson bill that preceded section 1 be stricken out, and that request was granted, and the remaining sections of the Vinson bill were stricken out, but the preamble, which preceded the enacting clause, was left undisturbed, and remained in the bill just preceding the enacting clause. No action whatever was taken by the House, or by the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union with respect to the preamble except, as before stated, the gentleman from Texas objected to its being read, as a preamble is never read. And, of course, unanimous consent is usually requested for the preamble to be stricken out, but as to this bill, no such request was made.

The parliamentary inquiry I desire to make is this: although it is not usual to leave preambles in a bill that is finally passed, yet the preamble to this bill is so apropos and was so well written in the bill introduced by our friend, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. VINSON], and it so well applies to the Patman bill that it should stay in, and not be stricken out, and I wish to ask the Chair whether or not the preamble could be stricken out except by unanimous consent, or by a motion passed by the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Texas that the only way it can be done is by action of

the House. No action was taken by the House with respect to striking out the preamble, so it still remains.

Mr. BLANTON. And will remain unless it is stricken by unanimous consent or by motion.

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I think it should stay in the bill because it is so well written, and is so apropos and applies so well to the Patman bill, of which it has now become a component part.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. As I recall, it was while the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] was taking one of his rare naps.

Mr. BLANTON. No; I never nap; I am wide-awake all the time, and that is the reason I am having this matter thoroughly understood now.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. It is very rare for the gentleman to be caught asleep at the switch, but as I recall it, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] made the point of order to the inclusion of a preamble in a House resolution, and the point of order was sustained. The preamble, of course, is very splendidly written; I wish I could take the credit for it, but it was done at a convention of the American Legion in Miami; and I hardly think that even the gentleman from Texas would want to retain a preamble of that organization which has been maligned so much by certain Members of the House. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the RECORD will show no point of order striking out the preamble. And while we did not follow the few high officials of the American Legion in adopting their "officials' bill" which would have issued \$2,000,000,000 more of tax-exempt bonds for multimillionaires to use in evading all taxes to this Government, we did follow the men, the army of men, who belong to the American Legion, who wrote and framed that preamble at Miami, and we do not want their Miami preamble to go out. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. After all, the RECORD will govern the matter. If it was stricken out, it is out.

Mr. BLANTON. The preamble was not stricken out; he made objection only to the reading of it.

The SPEAKER. Under those circumstances, of course, it will remain in the bill unless the House should determine otherwise.

Mr. FIESINGER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LAMNECK] is absent on account of illness. Had he been here yesterday he would have voted for the Patman amendment; he would have voted "nay" on the two motions to recommit and would have voted "yea" on the final passage of the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on the point of order I desire to say, in reply to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. VINSON], that the American Legion not only approved the preamble but they approved the Patman bill, which we have just passed.

Mr. McFARLANE. And how!

Mr. RANKIN. Almost unanimously.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS—ADJUSTED-SERVICE CERTIFICATES

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there has been no question of national interest, in recent years, with respect to which there has been a more complete change of attitude, by a large portion of our people, than that of the immediate payment of adjusted-service certificates to World War veterans.

Notwithstanding that less than 2 years ago sentiment for and against the immediate payment of adjusted-service certificates was clearly defined and almost evenly divided, yet today the opposition has all but disappeared. The only question that now claims interest, or is the subject of debate, relates to how or by what means it shall be paid.

It is needless to say that this change of attitude is highly gratifying to me, as one of those who from the beginning has recognized the justice of the claim presented by our ex-service men for immediate payment of their certificates. It is equally unnecessary, in view of my interest in this matter, as shown by my vote in the past, to say that I will again, today, for the third time since I have been a Member of

this House, cast my vote in favor of the enactment of legislation to accomplish this justifiable end.

It is, indeed, unfortunate that at this time there should arise a difference of opinion between advocates for immediate payment as to the means by which payment should be made.

I am of the opinion that the plan which has been offered to enable payment to be made by the issuance of new currency, backed by the gold reserve in the Treasury of the United States, is preferable under conditions now existing to any other plan yet offered. Some of those who are opposed to this plan have sought to create prejudice by cry of "fiat" or "printing press" money. Yet, in fact, the plan is similar and identical in principle with that by which Federal Reserve banks have been and now are permitted to issue bank notes, and bears the stamp of approval of leading economists and financial experts who declare that such a plan will not disrupt or disarrange our financial structure, and that it is safe and sound. This is clearly indicated in the testimony given by Governor Eccles, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, at a meeting of the House Committee on Banking and Currency Thursday afternoon, March 14, 1935, when he was asked the following question:

Then, Governor, on the question of soundness, which, in your judgment, is the more sound, a Federal Reserve note, issued against United States bonds, or a United States note issued against certain gold reserve?

He replied:

I think they are equally sound.

It is this latter plan, to wit, "a United States note issued against certain gold reserve", that is the basic principle of the method of immediate payment to which I have referred as being, in my opinion, more preferable under present existing conditions to any other plan yet offered. The reply of Governor Eccles, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, leaves no doubt or uncertainty as to its soundness and is a complete answer to the opponents of such plan.

An outstanding advantage of the plan to which I have referred arises from the fact that it provides a means of payment that does not require the issuance of any additional tax-exempt, interest-bearing bonds. It will thus save to the Government approximately \$2,000,000,000 of interest money that otherwise would be paid out during the life of the bonds. Furthermore, the plan of issuing Treasury notes against the gold reserve in the Treasury not only gives a 100-percent security but creates a security greater than exists back of any Federal Reserve or national-bank note now in circulation. It also eliminates the necessity of withdrawing any funds from the Treasury, and consequently it neither creates nor increases a deficit. Thus is provided a means of payment that in no way increases the burden of taxation and yet provides payment of a debt due our veterans at a time when needed by the vast majority of them.

However, while I may prefer as a method of payment the plan to which I have referred, yet I am unwilling, by insistence upon that or any plan, to thereby make more difficult the immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates to our veterans. The paramount issue is payment at this time. The particular method to be employed is immaterial, provided it is adequate and sound. No true friend of the veteran will permit himself to become involved in a controversy over methods that will prove detrimental to the veteran. Consequently, if some other plan than that to which I have referred should prove more acceptable to a majority of the House or Senate after conference is had between them, then I am ready and willing to give my support to such plan, provided it is, as I have already said, adequate and sound.

I do not intend to permit my interest in behalf of the veteran, in this important matter, to be diverted by an argument over whose name shall be attached to the legislation, or who shall have the credit. Veterans are in distress. Their need is great, and we should not permit anything other than the welfare of the veteran to determine our action in this matter.

This is a time of need, and as such justifies the immediate payment of the benefits of the adjusted-service certificates to veterans. To do so would be in accord with the spirit of the act of 1925, under which Congress provided adjusted-service compensation, although, under the language of the act, payment was limited to (1) in case of death, (2) in 1945, this latter being a time when the average age of a World War veteran would be 51 years. In both instances it will be recognized that a condition of need would probably exist. In the first instance because death has taken away the breadwinner of the family and the latter because advancing age makes it increasingly difficult to obtain adequate remunerative compensation. We are all familiar with the condition that makes it exceedingly difficult for anyone beyond 45 years of age to procure employment in any industrial establishment. Therefore, we can assume that Congress in the passage of the Adjusted-Service Certificate Act sought to provide help as these conditions of probable need should arrive in the life or death of veterans of the World War.

We must not overlook the fact that when the Adjusted Service Act was passed in 1925 our country was enjoying a fair amount of prosperity. For this reason there was no thought of need arising in any other manner than that provided for in the bill. Certainly, there was no thought that the time would ever come when such wide-spread distress would exist in America as we are now and have been experiencing for more than 5 years. The best evidence of this was the failure to include in the provisions of the bill any method by which a veteran could obtain a loan on his certificate in case need by any other cause should arise. Hence, the necessity for Congress to amend the act in this particular, so that loans might be procured by veterans in need arising as a result of the prevailing economic conditions affecting business, industry, finance, and agriculture. But unfortunately a rate of interest was fixed which when compounded and charged to the loan would leave but a few dollars coming to the veteran in 1945 unless he had repaid the loan. This, under present conditions, is impossible. Thus, unless the present legislation is passed, few veterans will get anything whatsoever even in 1945.

If the Government had dealt fairly in the matter of adjusted-service compensation, the debt would have been paid long ago, and instead of such not being due until 1945, as claimed by so many who have spoken against the bill, the fact is that on the basis the service was rendered in 1917-18, and with 6-percent interest from that time until the present, it was due in full on October 1, 1931. It is an overdue payment instead of a payment not yet due. And do not overlook the fact that a payment upon this basis is merely recognizing and applying a principle to soldier compensation that has already been acknowledged and applied by the Government to compensation and claims paid to others. It is not doing for the soldiers any more than has been done for civilians; and if a preference had been asked in behalf of our ex-service men, who more than they would be entitled to such consideration?

This bill is not selfish in character nor restricted in its benefits to a soldier class. Bear in mind that it will bring benefits not merely to approximately 4,000,000 ex-service men, but to their families as well, and will thereby touch approximately 20,000,000, or one-sixth of our entire population. And the benefits of this act will not stop even there. The money under this act will go into every nook and corner of our great country. It will be utilized to pay debts long past due, stop foreclosures, and provide health and the necessities of life for millions. In the expenditure of these funds the merchants, the banks, and small business men in every community will feel its beneficial effects.

It will mean the expenditure in the First Congressional District of New Jersey, which I have the honor to represent, of almost \$7,000,000. Of this amount the veterans of Camden County will receive \$4,826,728.56, and there will be paid to the veterans of Gloucester County \$1,354,442.26, and to those of Salem County \$704,634.42, making a grand total of \$6,885,805.24 that will enter into the channels of trade of the three counties comprising the First Congressional District of New

Jersey. And all of this may be without one cent of additional expense to the Treasury of the United States and without adding one cent to the tax burden of our people. In this connection, do not forget that the money so to be paid would not be wasted. Investigation conducted by the Veterans' Administration as to how and in what manner the moneys loaned on adjusted-service certificates had been expended revealed the fact that 93 percent had been used in discharging obligations, making worth-while purchases, and in other wise and judicious ways.

Therefore, in conclusion, this bill instead of being for the benefit of a favored few will result in beneficial effects that cannot be estimated and that will touch, directly or indirectly, practically all of our entire citizenship. And if this were not sufficient justification for favorable consideration being given to the bill, then let it be upon the basis of our discharging a national debt long past due for a quality of service that brought safety and security to our entire people.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to express my own views on the adjusted-service certificate, which is commonly called the "soldier's bonus", and matters relevant to veterans.

Mr. Speaker, it matters to me very little what bill I support, whether the Patman or the Vinson bill, providing for redemption of the adjusted-service certificate before its regular time of maturity in 1945, provided that bill will mean the immediate cash payment of the soldier's bonus. In my humble opinion, the Vinson bill does not mean that, because if the Vinson bill were enacted some method of payment must be agreed upon, and the issue would be thrown right back into the lap of Congress to provide ways and means of taxation or the floating of bonds to offset this expenditure of over \$2,000,000,000.

The Patman bill provides that each certificate is an obligation of the Government, and proposes that each veteran deposit his Government obligation and receive new money in United States notes in return for the remainder of his bonus certificate due, which will not create a new debt but merely allowing the veteran a method of facilitating payment of his debt by permitting the United States Government to manufacture new notes of currency, which we have been permitting bankers to do right up to the present time. The one thing, besides assuring immediate cash payment to the World War veteran of his bonus certificate, important about this Patman bill is the fact that by the United States itself issuing these new notes, our Government will avoid any interest payments that the floating or issuance of any bonds or Treasury notes will entail. It will be a debt once and for all "swept clean" of our national account.

Perhaps I am mistaken in my opinion that we should really employ some of the idle money as provided in the Patman bill and thus assure the soldier of the World War that, even after he gets his money, it will be worth the value he receives.

I think the real issue in this fight is to override a Presidential veto, and it looks as if some stronger crusading on the part of the veterans' organizations is going to be necessary to do this.

I would hate to pass some bill here in Congress, then 6 or 7 months later have to go back home and campaign for reelection and explain how it is that I voted for a bill and the soldier did not have any sight of ever getting his money.

If we embark upon a plan to pay out this bonus money over a period of a year or longer, and not all in the same relative space of a short time, or a few months, then we might be able to get by with a bill like the Vinson bill. If we are to pay out two and a half billions of dollars, which is practically half of all the currency we have in circulation today in the United States, within a relevant short period of time, you can imagine what may happen. That is the only chief concern as relates to the merit of the bill itself. The real issue is a Presidential veto which waits for any bonus bill, whether the Vinson or the Patman, and for any bonus bill a doubt looms in the other body for a two-thirds majority necessary to overcome a veto. I am 100 percent for the soldiers and their dependents. A study made by the Veterans'

Administration relating to the direction in which veterans expended money obtained through loans on their bonus certificates disclosed that 93 percent of this money went for subsistence and other useful purposes, and only 7 percent of that money was spent in such a way as to afford no practical benefit to the veteran or his family.

In Louisiana there are 53,885 bonus-certificate holders. If the face or maturity value of these certificates is paid in full at this time there will be a remainder due the veterans of Louisiana in the amount of \$27,849,762.05. Out of that total for Louisiana, the three parishes in the First Louisiana Congressional District which I represent would receive the following amounts for its World War veterans:

Orleans Parish	\$6,123,096.42
St. Bernard Parish	86,915.67
Plaquemines Parish	128,237.98

Let us pay our debt to the World War vet. The E. R. A. at the present time is taking care of many of these veterans who are capable of doing the work they want them to do on a work project in any community. Those on the E. R. A. would be relieved from this aid at least for sometime if given this money due on their bonus certificate. But that is just half the story. Consider the poor fellow who has been cut out of his disability allowance by the 1933 Economy Act and who has never been restored by law to the pension rolls. That poor fellow, because he is physically disabled, and even the veteran who cannot prove service connection—and what a job he has trying to prove it—cannot get on the relief rolls of the E. R. A. The result? Well, this type of veteran of any war, particularly the World War veteran, is unable to draw a pension or disability allowance or a monthly compensation; furthermore, the local E. R. A. tells him "you are not physically able to perform a day's work on our work project, therefore we cannot take care of you—it is up to private or community charity"; furthermore, the Civil Service tells him substantially this: "Our physical examination report finds you unfit to perform the services required for the position of postal clerk"—steward, inspector, or whatever the case may be. Thus, we find this particular type of unfortunate, who did don the uniform for Uncle Sam during the World War, and who sacrificed a \$50-a-week-or-more job for a \$30- or \$40-a-month job in the Army or Navy, today crying aloud, more than ever, to Congress for payment of their bonus. To these unfortunate patriots, we of Congress, owe them this gratitude, and should take further steps to provide more liberally for these men of war and their dependents.

Mr. PETTINGILL. Mr. Speaker, I have always favored paying the veteran of the World War the present value of their adjusted-service certificates. On the other hand, in a period of universal distress I have not been able to square my sense of responsibility to the country, and its taxpayers by voting to pay the future value in 1945, which is \$1,000,000,000 more than the present value.

In other words I have always favored paying the soldier a sum that would double his army pay, together with interest thereon at 4 percent compounded from the end of the war to date of payment.

In 1935 I would pay what we owe in 1935. I do not think we should ask the taxpayers to pay in 1935 what will not be due until 1945—in other words, pay 10 years' interest in advance.

If we were prosperous, if we did not have a huge national debt, if we did not have millions on relief, if taxpayers were not groaning under their load, to pay now what will be due in 1945 would be something the Nation could take in its stride. But, it cannot do so today.

To pay what is due at the date of payment is fair to the veteran; it is fair to the Nation, and it is fair to the taxpayer. I cannot be justly charged with being an "enemy" of the ex-service man to be willing at all times, even in the worst depression in our history, to pay him what is presently due. If that is not fair and right, nothing is fair and right.

For this reason I have voted in the committee and in the House for the substitutes, offered by Senator TYDINGS of Maryland and Mr. ANDREW of Massachusetts, both ex-service

men with distinguished overseas service records, and both of which substitutes embody the principle I have stated, a principle, by the way, which I strongly advocated before the Ways and Means Committee almost 3 years ago, on April 25, 1932.

It is a moral certainty that either of these bills, if passed by both the House and Senate, would be approved by the President of the United States and the soldier would be paid what is due him today.

These bills provide that either now or at any time before 1945 when the service man wanted to cash his certificate for its present value he could have every cent that is due him.

I regret, however, that certain Members seem to think that the soldier would rather have a "vote" than cash. The Patman bill passed the House in 1932. The soldier got the Congressmen's votes but no cash. The Patman bill again passed the House in 1934, and again the ex-service man got a "vote" but no cash. In 1935 the veteran gets another "vote." But if I understand the situation correctly, he will again get no cash.

I think the real friend of the veteran is the man who will vote for a measure that can become law, and not the man who votes for measures that cannot become law.

The veterans some day are going to appraise the votes of this House by actual results obtained and not by beating of breasts and loud protestations of friendship which get nowhere. In saying this I know many Members are perfectly sincere in thinking the veterans should be paid the 1945 value now. But their sincerity puts no money in pockets back home. Any bill to become law has to meet the approval of the Senate and the President as well as the House.

I am getting tired of passing the buck to the ex-service man. I prefer to be honest with him.

I hope that the Senate will agree to the Tydings or Andrews or some similar bill which the President can conscientiously sign without destroying the remaining credit of the Nation and that the House will then agree to accept it. Then the veteran can be paid what is now due him without increasing the present or future debt of the Nation.

I do not, however, favor paying a billion dollars that is not now due. To do so would make it still more difficult and perhaps impossible for the Nation to prevent actual destitution in millions of homes of both veterans and nonveterans and their wives and children.

This is no time to increase the burden on taxpayers by paying a billion dollars not due.

Mr. SANDERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in order to keep the RECORD straight, I wish to incorporate the views which I expressed in Report No. 384, which was made by the Committee on Ways and Means to accompany H. R. 3896, and in which I expressed by preference for H. R. 1. Of course, H. R. 3896 is known as the "Vinson bill" and H. R. 1 as the "Patman bill."

I am in favor of paying the adjusted-service certificates and have so voted in the House before. I am not opposed to H. R. 3896 but prefer H. R. 1 for the following reasons:

1. It will not require a bond issue or additional taxes to make the payment. Therefore no new debt will be created and the Budget will in no way be affected.
2. Our Government has sufficient gold to redeem all outstanding currency 100 cents on the dollar, pay the veterans \$2,000,000,000 in gold, and have remaining a billion dollars in gold, and in addition, about a billion dollars in silver. The Government has \$1.50 in gold and 20 cents in silver for every dollar outstanding.
3. The payment can safely be made according to the terms of H. R. 1, and without invoking a new principle or precedent for the issuance of money.
4. The bill provides for methods that will prevent inflation of the currency. Under its terms, the Secretary of the Treasury may cause to be retired Federal Reserve notes or national-bank currency in the event there is danger of an undue expansion of the currency, or in the event the price level rises above the 1921-29 average.
5. Our circulating medium, consisting of demand deposits and outstanding money amounting to \$200 per capita from 1926 to 1929, is now about \$150 per capita. The payment as suggested in H. R. 1 will restore \$16 per capita of this circulating medium that will be quickly and uniformly distributed into every corner of the Nation; additional purchasing power will be placed into the hands of those who will use it to buy goods.
6. The Government made a profit of \$2,800,000,000 on gold revaluation. This debt of \$2,000,000,000 can be paid to the veterans from that profit.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, the debate which has been going on in the House for some time relative to the payment of the adjusted-service certificates, commonly called the "bonus", is now at its height.

The primary purpose of this discussion is to decide which of the two plans—the Patman cash-payment plan, or the Vinson plan to raise the \$2,200,000,000 owed to the veterans by issuing bonds—should be accepted by this body to discharge this obligation.

I have the highest regard for the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. VINSON], who wishes to pay off this debt by issuing bonds, as I also have for Mr. PATMAN, the gentleman from Texas, who advocates payment of the bonus with cash from the United States Treasury. However, it is my thought that Mr. PATMAN's plan is the best, the most economical, and the method through which this money can be distributed with the least possible delay and red tape.

UNFAIR TO CHARGE TAXPAYERS BOND INTEREST

Owing to the fact that we have already passed a bill to appropriate \$4,880,000,000 to be spent on a huge public-works program—the money to be raised by issuing bonds—I feel that to saddle an additional \$2,220,000,000 bond issue on the country, as the Vinson plan is designed, is asking too much of the taxpayers at this time, when the money can easily be raised under the Patman plan, without the cost of a dollar to the Government. I believe every fair-minded citizen will agree with me that where this Government can save interest on bond issues that it is of benefit to the taxpayers that this be done.

ENOUGH GOLD IN THE TREASURY

There is ample gold and silver in the United States Treasury to back up the credit of the money spent by paying the bonus in cash, and, therefore, my friends, I am very much in favor of the Patman plan of payment of the bonus in cash. While a great many people will refer to this as "printing press money", the money paid to the veteran, under the Patman plan, will be the same kind, wording, color, size, form, and combination as the money you use every day.

It has been rumored that the President will veto the Patman bill, but there has been no assurance that the President would not have vetoed the Vinson measure if it had passed the House and Senate. Should the Senate concur in the House's action and pass the Patman bill and the President subsequently sign it, making it a law, I feel that the purchasing power of the Nation will be immediately restored or substantially so with the distribution of this huge sum, and that the people of this great country of ours will be on the high road to recovery.

RESTORE PURCHASING POWER

There is not a Member in this House who will deny but that the immediate need of the country today and the chief obstacle that is hindering our national recovery is the lack of purchasing power. The largest percentage of our citizens have no money with which to buy the necessities of life. That is why I feel that the cash payment of the bonus now is a question of vital importance, because it means the distribution of more than \$2,000,000,000, if the bill becomes a law, in the trade channels of this country. I would also like to point out the following other reasons how the Government would benefit by payment of the bonus at this time and by the Patman method:

SEVEN REASONS FOR BONUS PAYMENT

First. It will pay a just, honest, acknowledged debt of this Government to the veterans of the World War.

Second. The money owed to the veterans is a part of the public debt; payment of this debt now will reduce the national indebtedness, the total money expended for payment of the bonus, by more than \$2,000,000,000.

Third. Payment of the bonus now will save thousands of veterans from losing one-half of the value of their adjusted-service certificates, as most of the veterans have borrowed up to 50 percent of the cash-surrender value of their certificates. The great majority of these veterans have been unable to pay the interest on their loans, and the result is that by 1945 the interest charges will eat up the other 50 percent.

Fourth. The country will benefit by placing directly in the hands of the veterans more than \$2,200,000,000; this money represents real purchasing power. Every dollar will change hands many, many times, so that it will result upward to \$20,000,000,000 worth of business in this great country of ours. I am sure that every business man will admit that this is enough to place us far up on the road to recovery.

Fifth. The money used to liquidate the debt to the veterans will be sound money backed by the Treasury of the United States, which has more than enough gold and silver to issue the currency needed to pay the veterans.

Sixth. Payment of the bonus as set forth in the Patman plan will require no increase in taxes and no bond issue of any kind. The fact is the Government will save more than \$2,000,000,000 in interest, or \$112,000,000 a year for 12 years until 1945, when this debt to the veterans would normally have to be met.

Seventh. The Government will also be saved the sum of \$10,000,000 in administrative expenses between now and 1945.

WHAT MONEY WILL MEAN TO MY DISTRICT

There are 3,545,284 veterans in the United States today who hold adjusted-compensation certificates. Of these, 3,019,382 have already borrowed half of the face value of their certificates. The amount due the vets after deducting the amount of the loans is approximately \$2,200,000,000. Here is what the cash payment of bonus will mean to the First Congressional District of Indiana, which I represent: It will mean that more than \$2,000,000 will be distributed to the veterans of my district. Taking into consideration that this money will change hands at least eight times, it is simple to estimate the benefit the people will receive through the payment of the debt.

VETERAN NEEDS THE MONEY

We have embarked upon a program of national recovery with the payment of the bonus as the most important step in that program. It cannot fail. No man or woman can logically justify the failure of the Government to pay the debt due to the veterans at this time. There is plenty of money in the Treasury. The veteran needs the money and the Government owes it to him. The country needs purchasing power, and we are in a position to supply adequate purchasing power through the payment of the certificates.

VETERANS WILL GO "OVER THE TOP" AGAIN

By payment of the bonus now the veteran will again go "over the top" to save his country from economic ruin, just as he went "over the top" to save his country from physical ruin in 1918.

The bonus bill is not a relief measure for the veteran alone. It is a bill to bring relief to the entire country. It is a sure road to recovery.

Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to arise at this time to support the payment of the adjusted-service certificates now held by the veterans of the World War. In doing this I am not only glad to do it as an individual Member of Congress but also as a member of the liberal progressive Farmer-Labor Party of the great State of Minnesota.

You all remember the hectic days of 1917-18, when the finest youth of our Nation marched away to defend this Nation. You all know the story of their suffering since that horrible conflict. Yes; you are all familiar with the legislation that was passed in 1924 which forced the service men to accept these so-called "bonus certificates." At that time there was money for the railroads, money for the war contractors, and money for anyone who had a claim against the Government. But when the Congress decided to consider the soldiers of the Nation, these men who wallowed in the muddy hell of a war, these men were told to wait until 1945 for their small adjustment. What a travesty on justice, what an un-American thing to do.

The people of my district have been keenly interested in this problem. For the most part they all want to see this bonus legislation passed. I am glad to show my cooperation by being a coauthor of the bill introduced by the distinguished Texan, Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN. I was the fifth

signer on the petition to bring this bill up for consideration on the floor of this House.

This bill will place in immediate circulation the sum of more than \$2,000,000,000. It does it in a perfectly sane and American way. It will give to the men who have defended this country real United States notes, backed by the resources and credit of the country. Some would cry "inflation." They are in the main the same group who howled so loudly for fear that we would go off the gold standard a few years ago. They are the same group who it appears are unwilling to have that provision of the Constitution which gives to the Congress the right to coin and regulate the value of money.

We all know that for years we have been paying tribute to the money crowd and to the international bankers. American agriculture and small business have been paralyzed. The wealth and the control of the wealth of the Nation has been taken over by a small group of individuals. Is it not high time we break this chain of bondage that has strangled the people of our country?

It is interesting to hear Members of the House decrying the fact that we are "saddling this Government currency on the soldiers." We who sent them to the hell of a war; we who saddled them with the most horrible war the world has ever known. Now are we to accuse them of a lack of understanding? The rank and file of the veterans in my State want the Patman bill passed. They know that WRIGHT PATMAN, the man who led the fight against Andrew Mellon, would never do a thing that would injure them or their country. They believe in his integrity and high purpose. To me this bill should be considered a badge of honor for every veteran to support and every Congressman to vote for.

Yes; I think the veterans will be proud of us. I am a practical dirt farmer. I know the problems of those that till the soil. I believe I understand the feelings of the great farm population of our land. They want this bill passed. The farmers have been driven to desperation over the condition of their business, that of agriculture. It was from the farms and humble homes of our Nation that the great majority of the soldiers and sailors came. It was to that part of our national life they returned after the war was over. But they have been shocked and burdened with hardships and distress under this man-made depression. Patiently they have carried the load. Silently they have just existed and watched their loved ones suffer. They want this debt paid. Shall we quibble over it? Shall we make pretty speeches and then send them back to wait and suffer more. My party, the Farmer-Labor, believes the principle that right must conquer might. This bonus payment will bring happiness to our people. I urge your earnest consideration of the bill. I am proud and thankful to have an opportunity to vote for it.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Speaker, there is very little that has been left unsaid concerning the payment of the veterans' bonus. Had I been a Member of Congress when the original law was enacted I would have then been in favor of paying immediately the bonus in cash. Since I have been a Member of Congress I have always favored and voted for the immediate payment of the veterans' bonus, and I shall continue to do so.

There is no question in my mind but what we will shortly here in the House pass a bill to this effect. What the final outcome will be as to the Senate's action in this regard, no one at this time is in a position to prophesy with any degree of accuracy. It appears now that, should any one of the pending measures pass both the House and the Senate at this session of Congress, it would likely be vetoed by the President. However, should the proposed legislation reach that stage any time soon, I am of the opinion that the House of Representatives will pass it over the President's veto. As to the Senate's attitude in this regard, I am not prepared to even venture an assertion. Most of us here, I am sure, would like to see the bonus paid at once, and we are doing what we can to bring that about.

From the beginning of my service in this House I have signed petitions and discharge motions, attended various conferences and caucuses, made speeches, worked for, and

cooperated in every way I could in an earnest effort to get the bonus paid.

I feel this bonus is a just obligation on the part of the Government to the veterans of the World War. It is a confessed debt, just, owing, and payable. The veterans need it, they are entitled to it, and, as it has not been paid up to now, it should certainly be paid immediately.

I appreciate the views of those who differ with me, and I accord to them the same privilege I reserve unto myself. However, regardless of the position you take, I believe we all agree that if the Government at this time pays the bonus it will not only help the veteran but it will benefit everybody. It will distribute practically \$2,000,000,000 that will go into every State, county, city, town, hamlet, and rural community of this Nation. It is estimated that there will be a turn-over of this money within the next 12 months of something like eight times. That means that this money will pay bills, provide for the necessities of life, purchase comforts for men, women, and children, create business, satisfy mortgages on homes and personal property, and in general make life more worth while. The statisticians say that the payment of the bonus now will cause this amount of money to do \$16,000,000,000 worth of additional business within the next year.

The best information obtainable from governmental sources in substance shows that 3,531,800 World War veterans now hold adjusted-service certificates as of December 1, 1934. The maturity value of these certificates is \$3,485,650,000, or an average of \$959.88 each. Since the law was enacted permitting veterans to borrow one-half of the face value of their certificates, 3,038,500 have borrowed \$1,465,000,000 on their certificates, not including interest after October 1, 1934. After deducting all loans, with interest to October 1, 1931, there is estimated to be owing to the veterans on their adjusted-service certificates \$2,015,162,456.76, which includes the amount due the ones who have not negotiated loans on their certificates.

In my own State—Mississippi—36,802 World War veterans will receive \$19,308,411.76.

The veterans of the 10 counties comprising the Second Congressional District of Mississippi that I have the honor and privilege to represent in Congress will receive the following amounts by counties:

Benton County.....	\$94,322.53
De Soto County.....	244,510.06
Lafayette County.....	192,028.54
Marshall County.....	239,040.83
Panola County.....	275,364.53
Tallahatchie County.....	341,879.62
Tate County.....	167,853.66
Tippah County.....	179,340.70
Union County.....	204,428.02
Yalobusha County.....	170,613.00

Total to veterans of Second Congressional District of Mississippi.....	2,109,381.57
--	--------------

I maintain that this great country of ours can afford and should always reasonably take care of those who fought its battles and defended it in time of war. I say with you who oppose this measure, let us economize, I am ready and willing to practice and vote for economy in Government, but we have done that long enough at the expense of the veterans. I am not one who is willing to deny the deserving veterans, or their widows and orphans, that to which I feel they are justly entitled. The best dollars spent for adequate national defense, for which I stand, are the dollars of a grateful nation to its worthy defenders.

By our acts here, my colleagues, let us keep alive the spirit of fair play and just dealings with our fellow man, and in a measure at least, do in the year 1935 what should have been done immediately after the war—pay the bonus!

Mr. DORSEY. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing new to be uttered about payment of the so-called "soldier bonus." Everything has been said, and well said, for the past decade. But there is immediate and great need for saying it all over again, because whether or not we like the job, we of Congress are bill collectors for veteranism, and we must adopt the technique of that profession. This calls for iteration, reiteration, repetition, ding-donging, and thence more repetition.

In short, we are dunning for an adjustment acknowledged to be due the veteran, and we are asking that an I O U be paid immediately when the need of most of these ex-service men is great. If there be any among us who complain that this bonus matter is a perennial question, let me tell you that every person who is dunned for payment of a just debt is annoyed by the periodical visits of the collector.

No great number, yet too many of our unthinking citizens, look upon this adjustment to the veterans as governmental largess—a handout, extracted through veteran lobbies and veteran threats. Such people, of course, have not taken the pains to learn that it is an adjustment against the unholy profits and high wages which grew out of the cost-plus contracts of World War days. If their memories cannot take them back to those mistakes of war times, they will do well to study the recent testimony before the Nye committee of the Senate. There they will find disclosure of the millions paid to the executives of one large steel company, and this does tell us the story of large salaries and extra payments made to clerks, stenographers, and machine operators at the very time when soldiers were returning with a \$60 extra payment and the task of picking up the thread of life in a world that had changed for them.

Let me cite a case well known to me, and doubtless you gentlemen know of similar examples. No adjustment that the Government makes will compensate this man. He started as an office boy in a Philadelphia stocking mill and attended evening classes in a textile school. After 4 years' training he set himself up as a cotton-yarn broker and secured enough accounts to become pretty well established. By 1915 he was representing small southern mills and selling their product to textile plants in the Philadelphia district. He was prospering. Before he enlisted he asked the mills to keep him in mind and resume connection with him if he returned from service, and they all wrote him nice letters of promise and wished him godspeed.

He returned to find that they had forgotten him and had made other affiliations which they would not change. His \$60 would not pay more than 1 month's office rent, so he took a job selling soap. He has never returned to the textile business for which he was especially trained at some expense and considerable sacrifice. Had he remained at home he would have become wealthy, for his line was very active during the war. Do you think the Government's \$1,200 adjustment squares the account with this man? Do you believe he feels he is accepting largess when he takes the adjustment? And is it your opinion that the Bethlehem Steel Corporation should be paid off promptly in cash while this man takes an I O U, payable in 1945? This case is typical of a considerable segment of veterans who were thrown out of stride in their life work and no adequate adjustment will ever be made for them. What the adjusted-compensation certificates attempted to square was the difference between the dollar a day the soldier received and the fancy wages plus extras the stay-at-homes were receiving.

Veterandom has pointed to the injustice of this situation and Congress after Congress has acknowledged the fairness of the claim. Let it be said of the veterans that they have not complained without suggesting a remedy. Like the good physician, they have diagnosed and then prescribed. They tell you that the condition which brought on the bonus is the cost-plus contract, and they prescribe the McSwain bill for taking the profit out of war to prevent a recurrence of the condition. No selfish group, thinking only of a hand-out, would be so intent upon setting up a remedy for future use.

I have little patience with the constant argument that we cannot afford to pay this adjustment. That contention began when Secretary Mellon, pleading poverty, persuaded President Harding to veto an adjustment bill. Shortly thereafter the Secretary boasting displayed a large surplus. That was in a period when big business was god and we small individuals had little access to the high councils. We could not afford to pay, they said, and we still hear the echo of it. I say that we can ill afford not to pay. Our national credit is affected by our indebtedness, it is true. But there is an internal credit, not posted on the exchanges, but in the hearts of our citizens, which is affected by how we

treat an acknowledged indebtedness to the men and women who served in a great national emergency. A new generation will fight our next war and it is more observing than you imagine how this Nation has viewed the debts of industrialists and the debts to the combatants.

If the contractor is paid off by 1920, and the veteran must wait until 1945, it can in all truth be said that our Republic is ungrateful. It is far from heartening to the youth of this land to observe a nation which thanks its soldiers, sailors, marines, and war nurses and then asks them to go to the end of the line that forms at the paying teller's window. It is time that we took that sign down from the teller's window which reads: "Closed to veterans—will reopen in 1945." Gladstone well said: "Justice delayed is injustice." Our veterans hold Government I O U's and they are doing what anyone does who holds an I O U and is broke. They are asking for immediate payment. Let the Congress be done with this job of bill collector for veteranism. The debt is acknowledged; let it be paid. Because the Patman bill really provides the means for payment, let us favor that measure. Then we will do well to study the hook-up between this adjustment and the McSwain bill (H. R. 5529) for taking the profits out of war. Let us extract our lesson from the mistakes of the past, and profit by them in future emergencies.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I favor the immediate payment of the bonus, plus interest at 4 percent compounded annually from the day of the armistice, November 11, 1918; and I favor an additional new bonus of \$206,000,000 by rebating the accrued interest which the veterans have contracted to pay the Government on money borrowed against their adjusted-service certificates.

This is more than fair. It is generous. We would thus be giving them over \$200,000,000 more than they are entitled to receive under the law which was passed by the Congress in 1924 with their hearty approval and at their request. The rebate of this interest the veterans agreed to pay seems justifiable because the money loaned them was, at least in a sense, theirs. These loans may reasonably be regarded as partial payments on account, in reduction of the amount of a valid obligation, though not due.

Of course the veterans are not entitled to receive any part of the balance remaining unpaid of their adjusted-service certificates at this time. There can be no question as to what the adjusted-service certificates are, nor how the amount of each certificate was arrived at. They were issued in pursuance of the World War Adjusted Compensation Act of 1924, part of which reads as follows:

The amount of adjusted-service credit shall be computed by allowing the following sums for each day of active service in excess of 60 days in the military or naval force of the United States after April 5, 1917, and before July 1, 1919, as shown by the service or other record of the veteran: \$1.25 for each day of overseas service and \$1 for each day of home service; but the amount of the credit of a veteran who performed no overseas service shall not exceed \$500 and the amount of the credit of a veteran who performed any overseas service shall not exceed \$625.

It was agreed and provided by law that this bonus be made the basis of the adjusted-service certificates, which should each be the equivalent of a paid-up 20-year endowment insurance policy. To the amount of the adjusted compensation 25 percent was added to cover the interest thereon from the date of the discharge of the veteran from the service to the date of the passage of the act. The Director of the Veterans' Bureau was ordered to issue, without cost, to each veteran a paid-up nonparticipating 20-year endowment insurance policy called an "adjusted-compensation certificate" for the amount that the veteran's adjusted compensation, plus this 25 percent, would buy at the veteran's attained age, in accordance with accepted actuarial principles, and based upon the American Standard Experience Table of Mortality, plus interest at 4 percent compounded annually. This was, of course, done, and the face value of these certificates include 20 years' interest from the time the certificate was issued. Most of these certificates were issued in 1925. Hence the prevalent erroneous assumption that they all will mature in 1945. As a matter of fact, however, many of them were issued long after 1925,

some having been issued within the last few months, and at least one on January 1, 1935. This one will not mature until 1955.

These certificates are not bonds bearing interest on their face values, and which may be converted into cash whenever the holder sees fit. They are single-payment insurance policies, on which the service of the individual veteran paid the premium, but which do not mature—that is, attain their face value—until the 20 years of compound interest accumulation, plus the original cash credit and less a small insurance cost for 20 years, equals the face value. This result will be accomplished 20 years after the date of the issuance of each certificate, and not before.

Many veterans and other citizens honestly believe that the face value of these certificates and the cash value are one and the same thing. They apparently do not understand that the face value of these certificates has included in it 4-percent interest, compounded annually for 20 years, up to the date when the payment of the certificates was fixed by law to be made. Another feature of these certificates which is frequently overlooked or misunderstood is that the face value of each certificate is payable immediately in case of the death of the veteran holding the certificate. I hate to deprive the dependents of the ex-service man of this valuable insurance right. But since practically all of them, and the accredited organizations speaking for them, now demand the immediate payment of the bonus—I assume with full realization that if this be done it will extinguish this valuable insurance right—I am perfectly willing to accede to their request. Since they want their certificates cashed now, I am glad to vote that they be paid the full present value of their certificates, and in addition I am heartily in favor of wiping out the interest charged against them for the money they have borrowed on their certificates, although they agreed in perfect good faith to pay this interest.

Of course, the amount due them, if these certificates are to be cashed now, is the original amount of each certificate, and since it was for services performed prior to the date of the armistice, November 11, 1918, I am perfectly willing to add to the adjusted compensation interest at the specified rate of 4 percent and compound it annually from Armistice Day, 1918, up until the date of payment. In addition to this I am in favor of releasing them from their voluntarily assumed obligation to pay interest upon the sums borrowed against these certificates. This is in effect adding to what is really due—fixing the amount at the present value of their certificates—a new and additional bonus of \$206,000,000 of accrued interest.

In spite of the fact, which seems to me indisputable, that this is what the veterans are entitled to today, and more, both the Patman and Vinson bills provide for the payment now not only of what is now the present value of the certificates, and not only this second bonus of \$206,000,000, but also, and in addition thereto, another thousand million dollars. A third bonus of over a billion dollars—some estimate it as high as sixteen hundred million dollars. In other words, the Patman and Vinson bills provide for the payment of the unearned interest on the amount of the adjusted compensation for the remainder of the 20-year period just as though all of the certificates had run for the full period of 20 years and had been fully matured by the accumulation of the compound interest for that length of time.

These bills camouflage the issue. If we wish to double the bonus we first agreed to give the veteran, then let us be frank enough to say so, fairly and squarely, in a separate bill which could then be considered on its own merit. But to tie this proposal in with the entirely reasonable demand that what is now due under the original bonus bill be paid is to hide a stowaway in the fuselage of a supposedly one-passenger plane.

These bills also create a mirage of false hope. No well-informed person believes either has a chance to become a law. There is no water in either well. It is practically a certainty that one or the other of these bills—probably the Patman—will pass the House. But the Patman bill has twice before been passed by the House. Never have its friends been able to muster more than 31 votes for it in the

Senate. Each bill is opposed by the President. If either one should be passed by the Senate, after having been passed by the House, it would be vetoed, unquestionably. It is utterly unreasonable to think, therefore, that either bill could receive the necessary two-thirds vote of the Senate to override the President's veto.

If we really want to pay the veterans now—and I do, since they ask it—then let us pass a bill which can also pass the Senate and which will be approved by the President. There are several such bills now pending. Any one of the McReynolds, Cochran, or Andrews bills would accomplish the desired end with justice to all and would in all probability be approved by the President.

None of these bills would require any increase of taxes.

None of these bills casts an added burden on the Treasury.

None of these bills is subject to the criticism that it would require inflation.

Personally, I favor the McReynolds bill, plus the \$206,000,000 interest-charge elimination. I shall be glad to cooperate with all those of similar mind on this subject, and work and vote to accomplish the passage of some such sound, fair, generous settlement of this vexed issue.

Let us stand by our great pilot, whose strong and steady hand is guiding the Ship of State through the tempestuous seas, which but for him would have engulfed us. His heart is big enough to include us all within the scope and compass of his mighty sympathies. His sources of information are dependable, unbiased, and far superior to those available to any of us. His mind is great enough to grasp and fathom the deepest implications of this problem. Let us not rock the boat, but follow his sympathetic, informed, able, and courageous leadership.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, life would be a sorry chapter if we could not learn some lessons from the pages of the past. Some of us may remember that when Themistocles was the virtual dictator of ancient Greece and after he had levied tribute upon the provinces, he finally came to the Isle of Andros. Landing with his troops, Themistocles conferred with the elders of the isle, and demanded tribute. During that conference, he is reputed to have said:

"We have brought with us two great goddesses; one is named 'Persuasion' and the other 'Force.'"

One of the elders replied:

"Themistocles, we, too, have two great goddesses even more powerful than your own. One is called 'Poverty' and the other 'Impossibility.'"

And so, down the long train of ages poverty and impossibility have ever stood as the formidable opponents of persuasion and force.

I disagree with those gentlemen who urge that the only objective to be attained is justice to the veteran. All important as that objective may be, it is not the only hill to be taken nor the only woods to be penetrated; for, in the last analysis, the problem of the veteran is the common problem of all the people. If you can bring back to the American people a purchasing power, if you can bring back to a poverty-stricken people a modicum of prosperity, I fancy the veterans will be able, in a large measure, to solve their own problems and meet their own individual difficulties. The end to be attained, the objective to be reached, the thing to be accomplished is to revive business and to enable the people to again set forth upon the road to prosperity in private business.

Let us inquire of ourselves what is the real cause of all of this depression that has been abroad in the land for the past 5 years and over. In 1926, the commodity dollar was worth 100 cents in terms of universal commodity. They may talk about the circulation of actual money not being an index to prosperity, but those who do so speak forget the fact that actual money has never been the sole medium of exchange of our people. Since 1926 our liquid bank credits, that were used as money, have disappeared to the extent of over \$40,000,000,000 and with this shrinkage in our medium of exchange, money and what was used for money has become more and more scarce until the commodity dollar in terms of commodity has risen to the high

point of 203 cents. This means that the man who borrowed a thousand dollars in 1926 had to pay, if he paid his debt, in 203-cent commodity dollars; in acres of land, if he sold his land; in hours of labor, if he sold his labor; in bushels of wheat, if he sold his wheat; in bales of cotton, if he sold his cotton, \$2,030, which is a condition that neither he nor his creditor contemplated at the time they made the transaction.

Oh, they speak of the dangers of inflation, they speak of the rubber dollar, they speak of the 50-cent dollar, and we may grant that the 50-cent dollar is not an honest dollar, it never was and it never will be, but neither is the 200-cent dollar an honest dollar any more than is the 50-cent dollar. The very power to inflate implies the power to deflate. There would not need to be an inflation had there not already been a deflation of our medium of exchange, and an undue inflation is no more dishonest and no more evil in its effect than is an undue deflation.

Perhaps I can illustrate, and I do not want to seem facetious, for this is a serious problem that confronts the Nation, but when they speak of the dangers of inflation and the dishonesty of inflation, forgetting the dangers and dishonesty of deflation, I am reminded of old Bill Donaldson, who was a frontier surveyor in my boyhood days in Kansas.

Bill knew little about surveying and had no instruments of exact measurement, but he was the only surveyor and he did the best he could, so he cut himself a rawhide thong and tied the ends to each ankle so that his steps measured as nearly as possible 3 feet. Then he proceeded to step off the land. In the morning, when the dew was on the grass, the rawhide thong became wet and stretched to undue proportions, but as the afternoon sun dried it out it shrunk to far less than its normal length of 3 feet so that the man who had his land measured in the morning got more than his allotted portion, but the man who had his land measured in the afternoon received far less. Neither was correct, neither was honest; one was inflation and the other deflation.

It is unfortunate that we cannot have an exact medium of exchange based upon the relative value of commodities from year to year. It is unfortunate that Congress has not assumed the burden the Constitution has imposed upon it not only to coin money, but to regulate the value thereof, but we do know that for the present it is impossible for the people of this country to pay their debts until we increase the medium of exchange and bring up commodity prices to the point where the commodity dollar may reach its true value of 100 cents.

Let me put the situation in another way: In 1926 we had national assets of \$391,000,000,000. That represented every acre of land, all the stocks of goods upon the shelves, all the wheat and corn and cotton and coal and iron and oil, and every commodity within the confines of the United States. At the same time we had internal debts amounting, according to the various estimates, of between two hundred and nine and two hundred and forty billion dollars, so that we were then solvent. We had \$391,000,000,000 with which to pay, say, the lesser sum of approximately \$210,000,000,000, and there was a little left over by way of equities for those who had labored and produced.

Along came the depression, with the wiping out of our liquid bank credits, with the growing scarcity of money, with the consequent rise and doubling in the value of our commodity dollar until, we are told by those who have carefully examined and computed the Nation's wealth, our assets have depreciated in terms of dollars by \$200,000,000,000, leaving \$191,000,000,000 with which to pay \$210,000,000,000, and it cannot be done.

If the creditor class—and I do not like to speak of classes—but if those to whom the debts of the people of this Nation are owing should foreclose upon every mortgage and sue upon every debt, and issue execution upon every judgment, and take over to themselves everything of value within the confines of the United States, they would still be short nearly \$20,000,000,000, enough to satisfy their claims—if they had impoverished and pauperized all of the borrowing class, which includes the men who do the business and carry on the industry of this Nation.

You may curtail production and temporarily raise prices of one or more commodities, but you cannot increase wealth by destroying the wealth of this Nation. You cannot enable the people of this country to pay their debts by destroying or curtailing the production of the wealth with which they would pay. You can only enable them to pay their debts by increasing the medium of exchange to approximately what it was when the commodity dollar was at its normal value of 100 cents, when most of these debts were contracted.

They speak of an uncontrolled inflation of the currency. This Patman bill provides, in my judgment, for a controlled expansion of the currency. We may have to find other means for a further expansion if this proves insufficient, but reason and good sense must guide and determine the action of a Congress in carrying out the mandates of the Constitution to regulate the value of this Nation's currency. Failing in that, all the bonds and all the mortgages and all the debts will fail to realize their value in terms of dollars. You may seek redress in the courts, you may bring all the power of government to aid the holders of the securities of this Nation, you may call upon the twin goddesses, Persuasion and Force, but unless you give to these people a medium of exchange sufficient to meet their obligations those sullen, silent goddesses, Poverty and Impossibility, will continue to guard the gates of necessity.

Mr. FENERTY. Mr. Speaker, throughout the years since the World War, and repeatedly during my campaign for election to this House, I have consistently emphasized my belief that the bonus should be paid without delay to the veterans of the World War. I have not changed my belief, and I now gladly cast my vote for the immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates.

There has been much dispute as to the method by which these certificates should be paid. The inflationists favoring the Patman bill contend that the \$2,000,000,000 necessary for this purpose should be paid in printing-press money. The World War veterans who are sponsoring the Vinson bill ask that the bonus be paid in cash in the ordinary way, and they make no demand upon Congress as to the manner in which the funds may be raised. While I have my own views as to which of these methods is preferable and will result in final payment, I wish now to state that the question as to whether the Vinson or the Patman group be successful in the preliminary votes as to the method of payment can make no difference as far as my vote in favor of the bonus is concerned. The correspondence I have received from voters in my district indicates that an overwhelming majority of the veterans are in favor of the American Legion's bill, introduced by Mr. VINSON. There are some, however, who seem to favor the inflation bill introduced by Mr. PATMAN. But I really believe that the veterans are not so much interested in the method of payment as they are in the speedy and immediate cash payment of what is justly due them. The names of the Vinson bill or the Patman bill in themselves are not important to the veteran who is awaiting justice from a tardy Government. The veterans want payment, prompt payment, without further bickering or vetoes or delay, and, in my opinion, the veterans should get it. For this reason I would just as readily vote for any one of these bills that will truly guarantee to the veterans of the war the payment that they have so fully earned and which they now so vitally need.

It has appeared in the newspapers that the President is opposed to the Patman inflation bill and that he will refuse to sign it. If this be so, it is unfortunate for the veterans; but, even if the President be opposed to the payment of the soldiers' bonus, I for one shall vote to pass the bonus over his veto. I hope my colleagues in this House will similarly do so.

Those who favor the American Legion-Vinson bill have unanimously expressed the opinion that the inflationist Patman bill will place the millstone of inflation around the neck of the veteran and thus prevent the passage of the bill when it reaches the Senate. I hope this will not happen, although I would prefer to see the veterans' worthy cause standing alone, as it deserves to do, instead of being bound up with the theories of those who are for inflation first and last and only incidentally for the bonus and the veteran.

I believe that if we are for the bonus we should pay it without any strings tied to it.

It is nearly 20 years since the World War ended. After we returned from France the Government settled its debt in cash with everyone except the boys who had won victory for the Nation. Railroads, manufacturers, clerks, shipyard employees, all received cash for their services and were promptly paid. But the soldiers and sailors who fought to make the world safe for democracy were forgotten. Year by year hundreds of them are passing from our midst, leaving wives and children and other dependents without adequate means for the sustenance of life.

The least that the Congress should do today is to pass this bonus bill, so that, late as it is, the veterans shall at last know something of the gratitude which the Nation bears toward them. The bonus is long overdue. It should be paid at once.

Perhaps the President will attempt to prevent the payment of the bonus. Perhaps the inflationists will eventually defeat the will of the soldiers and cause the bonus to die under the weight of currency inflation. But, as I said a few moments ago, I have stood with the soldiers for over 10 years in their demand for justice. I shall support the cause of the veteran today. I care not what bill is before the House. I am for any bill that will give the veteran his just payment. It is, therefore, with great pleasure and satisfaction that I plead the cause of my war comrades and now cast my vote for the immediate payment of the soldiers' bonus.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I can state in a few words why I intend to vote this afternoon to pay to the veterans of the World War in cash the face value of their adjusted-service certificates.

As a Member of Congress I do not think I would be alive to my responsibilities or worthy of the high official station to which I have been called if I were not only willing, but eager, at all times and in every circumstance to vindicate the principles of justice.

I believe that payment of the adjusted-service certificates at this time is nothing more, and nothing else, than justice to the veterans who were deliberately adjudged by Congress 11 years ago to have an unpaid balance in their favor for services rendered.

"But", says someone, "it was not intended that the debt should be paid until 1945. To pay it now is irregular."

Perhaps that is so. Perhaps it is irregular to pay the veterans 10 years in advance of the time stipulated in the bond. But that is not the only irregularity connected with the World War. It was irregular to rip our fine young men from their homes and their loved ones and throw them into the hell of a foreign war. It was irregular to force these fine Americans to take up arms to kill people 3,000 miles away, whom they had never seen and whose tongue they did not speak. It was irregular to compel our boys to be wounded and gassed and shell-shocked and crazed by the bodily and mental tortures of war's inferno. All of that, too, was irregular, and God forgive me if I ever raise the cry of "irregularity" as an argument against the payment to the veterans of a small per capita amount which is intended to level down just a little way the glaring difference between the rich harvest reaped by swivel-chair war profiteers during the World War and the mere pittance paid to the men who endured all of the suffering of the trenches and the battlefields, many of whom came home pathetically broken in body and in mind.

Let each one of us place himself in the position of a veteran to whom the Government owes this acknowledged debt. If a man owes you a sum of money and you know he is able to pay; if you are starving and your wife is sick and your children are crying for food; if you have no money with which to buy fuel and no clothes with which to keep warm; if in these circumstances the man who owes you says, "I could settle with you, all right, but the money is not due yet and it would be irregular to pay you", I am sure you would have as much bitterness in your heart as any veteran has this day, because he cannot cash his bonus certificate

to keep his family from starvation. You would think that there is no such thing as justice in the world.

I do not concede that the debt is not due. The Government settled, fully and handsomely, with the munitions manufacturers and war profiteers at the close of the war, but it was not until 6 years later that the soldiers were granted their adjusted-service certificates. If compound interest were allowed on the adjusted-service compensation of the veterans dating back to the war, on the same basis as the settlement allowed those who did not go to war but reaped the profits of war, the adjusted-service certificates would now be nearly or quite due.

In these awful times of depression and enforced idleness, caused by the backwash of war, the veterans need their bonus money perhaps more than they ever will need it again. I am speaking now of the masses of veterans. Of course, there are some exceptions. A rich man in a letter assailing the bonus bill wrote to me:

I have two sons, and they are not asking for their bonus.

I could not help feeling a sense of shame for this man when I recalled that each one of his sons is worth perhaps half a million dollars. Of course, they are not asking for their bonus, but there are thousands and thousands of veterans who, under the spur of stark, abject necessity, are asking for theirs, and it is my privilege to give them a helping hand. "Ye shall reap as ye sow" is as true today as it was 2,000 years ago. We cannot have wars without paying the staggering costs of war. I will economize along other lines until it hurts, and I will vote to scrap a large part of our spending program, but I will never deny justice to the deserving veteran. The cry of "irregularity" makes no appeal to me, for justice outweighs it a thousandfold, and my conscience would not allow me to sleep if I did not vote on the side of the veterans in the roll call this afternoon.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On March 19, 1935:

H. R. 3266. An act authorizing the maintenance and use of a banking house upon the United States military reservation at Fort Lewis, Wash.

On March 21, 1935:

H. R. 5322. An act authorizing the President of the United States to present in the name of Congress a Medal of Honor to Maj. Gen. Adolphus Washington Greely;

H. R. 6644. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 134. Joint resolution to continue the commission for determining the boundary line between the District of Columbia and the State of Virginia for not to exceed 9 additional months, and to authorize not to exceed \$10,000 additional funds for its expenses.

EXTENSION OF AIR MAIL SERVICE

Mr. O'CONNOR, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution for printing in the RECORD:

House Resolution 167

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of the resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of H. R. 6511, "A bill to amend the air-mail laws and to authorize the extension of the Air Mail Service." That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority members of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as

ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

AVIATION CADETS IN THE NAVAL RESERVE

Mr. O'CONNOR, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution for printing in the RECORD:

House Resolution 168

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of H. R. 5577, "A bill to provide for aviation cadets in the Naval Reserve." That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. O'CONNOR, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution for printing in the RECORD:

House Resolution 169

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of H. R. 5576, "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes." That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

STRENGTH AND DISTRIBUTION OF THE LINE OF THE NAVY

Mr. O'CONNOR, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution for printing in the RECORD:

House Resolution 170

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of H. R. 5599, "A bill to regulate the strength and distribution of the line of the Navy, and for other purposes." That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

DISTRIBUTION, PROMOTION, RETIREMENT, AND DISCHARGE OF COMMISSIONED OFFICERS OF THE MARINE CORPS

Mr. O'CONNOR, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution for printing in the RECORD:

House Resolution 171

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of H. R. 4016, "A bill to repeal section 16 of the act entitled 'An act to regulate the distribution, promotion, retirement, and discharge of commissioned officers of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes', approved May 29, 1934." That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, on February 6 Senate Joint Resolution 24 was passed, permitting the Walter Reed Hospital to accept certain funds that were left to the hospital by the late Charlotte Taylor, of St. Petersburg, Fla. This matter has been considered by the House Military Affairs Committee. A unanimous report has been made, but the resolution must pass the House before the Walter Reed Hospital may take over these funds.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 24, to authorize the acceptance on behalf of the United States of the bequest of the late Charlotte Taylor, of the city of St. Petersburg, State of Florida, for the benefit of Walter Reed General Hospital.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand, this bill simply provides for the acceptance of a gift by the Walter Reed Hospital?

Mr. SEARS. That is correct.

Mr. SNELL. There is nothing else involved in the bill?

Mr. SEARS. That is all. The money is to be used for the purpose of buying radios, and so forth, for the disabled soldiers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc. That the commanding officer Walter Reed General Hospital be, and is hereby, authorized to accept the bequest of the late Charlotte Taylor, of the city of St. Petersburg, State of Florida, as contained in her last will and testament and such interest as may have accrued on the funds covered by such bequest, and to receipt therefor on behalf of the United States, and to deposit the funds so received in the Treasury of the United States as a special fund dedicated to the purchase of radio equipment or similar means of entertainment for bedridden soldiers or other patients in said hospital, said fund to be subject to disbursement for such purposes upon vouchers submitted by the commanding officer Walter Reed General Hospital under authority of the Secretary of War and to be available until expended.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McKEOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKEOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I was called out of the Chamber on the final roll call on the final passage of the Patman bill. After having supported this bill on all of the previous roll calls I would like to have at least the RECORD show that if I were here on the final roll call I would have voted for the final passage of the Patman bill.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman inform the House what the program will be for the first part of next week?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Monday, of course, is District day; but on account of the illness of the chairman of that committee, the business in order on that day will be postponed until Thursday. The air mail bill will be taken up on Monday. On Tuesday a rule providing for a change in the method of consideration of bills on the Private Calendar. If that rule does not take long, we may also commence consideration of the four bills from the Committee on Naval

Affairs, and continue that on Wednesday. Thursday, as I have stated, will be District of Columbia day, if we obtain the necessary consent. On Friday I hope to take up the Private Calendar. There are some 300 bills on that calendar, and the authors of those bills are quite anxious to have them considered as soon as possible. I hope to again adjourn over that Saturday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL SOCIAL-SECURITY PROGRAM AND THE CONGRESS

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the economic-security bill and to include therein a short statement by Dr. A. T. McCormack, of Louisville, Ky.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address delivered by Dr. A. T. McCormack, State commissioner of health of Kentucky and secretary of the Kentucky State Medical Association, at Louisville, Ky., March 3, 1935:

As I have said, I was in Washington throughout the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate on the social-security legislation, the outlines of which were submitted by the President's Committee on Economic Security, the general principles of which were introduced by a special message from the President.

As you know, it has been my privilege to be in Washington from time to time during the sessions of Congress for the past 25 years, studying legislation and the methods of legislation affecting medical service and public health. I wish every one of you and every American citizen who loves his country could have had enough of this experience to have acquired the profound respect for our national legislative body which I have. To the superficial observer who walks into the gallery of the House or Senate and sees and hears the drama, even of those historic occasions which happen a few times each session, when every Member is on the floor, when tension and excitement and great state strategy hold and thrill you, or on those far more frequent occasions when the roll is being tediously called and recalled, or when drab and routine debate is being participated in by a relatively small group of Members particularly interested in the special subject under consideration, the sessions of either the House or Senate seem to be confused and futile and wasteful. I believe it will be worth your while to consider for a few moments what really happens when a bill is introduced in Congress. Take this economic-security bill, for example. Being an administration measure of transcendent importance, it is introduced by the Chairman of the powerful Ways and Means Committee, receives a number, H. R. 4120, is printed, and referred to the Ways and Means Committee, which considers all legislation involving the raising of revenue. It is the great politico-economic committee of Congress. It is composed of 25 of the most experienced and influential Members of the House. The Democratic members are elected by the Democratic caucus and select the Democratic members of all the other committees.

It was interesting that during the 6 weeks of the hearings on this particular bill almost every member of the committee was present throughout its sessions. These hearings usually began at 10 o'clock in the morning and continued until half past 12. Unless matters of tremendous importance demanded the attendance of the members of the committee on the floor of the House, its session was resumed at 2 and continued until 5 or later. The members of the committee must attend to their personal mail, receive callers, and make departmental and other contacts in the mornings before the sessions or in the evenings after them. They were usually kept busy until midnight or later. Every statement made before the committee is taken by a reporter and each morning each member of the committee is furnished with a printed copy of the entire events of the preceding day. The first 2 weeks of the hearings were devoted to the members of the President's Cabinet and the economic experts who were presenting the evidence upon which the provisions of the bill were drawn. Following this any interested citizen who had information on the subject was invited to occupy 10 minutes in presenting his case and to submit for printing such data, maps, and charts as would support his ideas. Each witness was cross-examined by members of the committee for as long a time as was necessary to secure all the knowledge that witness had that was of value or to expose fallacies in his facts or arguments.

On the permanent staff of the committee are expert statisticians, economists, tax experts, legislative draftsmen, and they have available in the Library of Congress every reference to similar social or economic legislation in any country in the world. Translations of such data as is only in foreign languages are made immediately upon the request of any committee by the staff of linguists of the Library of Congress.

As an example of the promptness with which such data is assembled, an economic-security bill was introduced in the Parliament of Canada on January 28. Copies of this bill and the report supporting it were in the hands of the members of the Ways and Means Committee on the evening of the 30th. During the previous session of Congress a subcommittee held very extensive hearings on social-security legislation. These hearings had been printed and were in the hands of all Congressmen. There was no subject presented by any witness on which at least one or more members of the committee were not better informed than any of the witnesses.

When you realize that this single bill provides under title I appropriation for old-age assistance, with all the plans for its administration; under title II for aid to dependent children; under title III for earnings taxes by employers and employees; under title IV establishes a social-insurance board and provides for its duties and support, for the development and administration of unemployment compensation; under title V for annuity certificates; under title VI the necessary imposition of taxes for the support of these activities and for the development of an unemployment trust fund; under title VII for maternal and child health (under which heading the Federal aid which is helping support the bureau of maternal and child health under the supervision of Dr. Veech in our own State health department has been financed) and the care of crippled children and aid to child-welfare service, and, finally, under title VIII appropriations for public health, you will understand what a complicated and tremendously important study all of this involves. This single bill consists of 63 printed pages of about 25 lines each.

When the hearings on the bill are completed they are all printed with the accompanying tables and charts in a volume similar to the one I am exhibiting, and copies of these hearings are sent to each Member of the House and Senate.

The committee then went into executive session and for 3 or 4 weeks spent from 6 to 10 hours a day in careful study, first of the principles involved, then of the details of the administrative and revenue-producing sections of the measure. Each member of the committee takes part in the discussion of each item and all decisions are made by a vote of the committee. Then 2 or 3 weeks are required by the draftsmen and law officers of the Government, as well as by the astute legal minds on the committee itself, to make the final draft of the bill which is to be presented to the House.

From time to time intimations are given to the press by the chairman or by selected members of the committee of tentative decisions in its executive sessions so that the other Members of Congress and the public may be kept informed of the progress that is being made. Finally, the draft is completed and the chairman and a small subcommittee draft the report explaining the details of the bill. It is then reported to the House and goes on the calendar. Usually any such important administrative measure as the social-security legislation is considered by the House under a special rule which provides for several days of general debate, control of which is divided between the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and its ranking minority member. Special rules in such cases usually provide that no amendments may be considered except those offered by the committee itself. Such a rule is justified on the ground that legislation of such vast importance should be considered as a whole and should either be passed or rejected. Its thorough consideration by one of the legislative committees of the House in the manner I have described assures a bill its perfection in accordance with the political philosophy of the party which controls the administration.

Generally those opposing the bill are allowed to make one motion to recommit it to the Ways and Means Committee, with instructions to bring it in with certain modifications. After this routine motion is voted down the bill is generally passed with the support of most of the members of the party in control of the House, and in legislation of national importance quite frequently with the support of most of the minority members also.

Whether considered under a special rule or under the general rules of the House, bills are considered for amendment by the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union which generally has divided time for general debate, and then considers each section under the 5-minute rule. Sections of the bill are read by the Clerk. Committee amendments perfecting the section are offered first and adopted as a matter of course. Then germane amendments may be offered by any Member, and discussions are limited to 5 minutes for and 5 minutes against the amendment, and a vote is then taken in the Committee of the Whole. When this Committee has finished its consideration of the bill it rises and reports the bill as amended to the House. A separate vote may be demanded on any amendment, and then the previous question is moved, and the bill as amended is passed or defeated by a viva voce or an aye-and-no vote.

The bill now goes to the Senate, where it is referred to the Finance Committee. This committee has been holding hearings on practically the same bill, which was introduced by Senator WAGNER, of New York. The hearings were concurrent with those before the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the same witnesses as a rule were present.

It seems to me that the House has a distinct advantage in that the members of its important committees are members of only one committee. Due to its smaller membership, Senators are usually members of quite a number of committees, many of which meet at the same hours. Consequently there is a generally smaller attendance at the meetings of the Finance Committee than of the Ways

and Means Committee, but all the hearings are printed and the Senators have the opportunity of reading such evidence as is of interest or value to them.

When the bill is reported to the Senate, the Senate committee will be ready with its amendments to the House bill. In the Senate there is no rule limiting debate, and any Senator can offer an amendment any time he pleases. Powerful blocs are, because of this, frequently able to secure Senate amendments that have not been as thoroughly considered in connection with the other provisions of the bill or of existing law as they should be. Senators accept this as a lesser evil than the curtailing of debate or the limitation of the offering of amendments, and feel rather secure as a rule about it, because after the bill has passed the Senate it is referred to a conference committee between the two Houses, consisting of the ranking members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee in the Senate, whose members know most about the legislation. They compromise the differences between the two Houses and bring in a privileged conference report that is generally the best legislation that can be passed on that particular subject. When a conference report has been adopted by both Houses the bill is enrolled and goes to the President, who either signs or vetoes it.

This identical procedure takes place on every bill that is introduced into the House or Senate of the United States that is considered at all. Of course, hundreds of bills are introduced each session that receive no consideration in committee. Many of these are duplicates of others that are considered and many others are introduced at the request of friends of Congressmen, who realize that they will receive no serious consideration.

I have taken your time to tell you these details because I think every American citizen should understand something about them. Knowledge of the methods by which legislation is passed by the Federal Government will increase our respect for that august legislative branch which is essential to the preservation, not only of orderly government but of liberty itself. When one reads the newspaper accounts of the sensational and vapid utterances of a demagog, or even listens to the tedious meanderings of some thoroughly honest but tiresome speaker on the floor, it is important for him to realize that while this apparent waste of time is taking place the really serious work of Congress is being done in its hard-working committees.

To one who knows, even an apparent disorder which so frequently characterizes proceedings on the floor has through it all, nevertheless, a system and routine that usage has made practical and useful in the consideration of legislation for the welfare of all the people of the United States.

It is important also to remember that rank on committees is largely due to seniority in service. For this reason, intelligent congressional districts in the States elect competent, effective Senators and Representatives from term to term so that they may qualify themselves as statesmen for the great profession of Federal legislation and so they may be sufficiently influential to really help guide the affairs and destiny of the Nation.

It is well for our people to remember that the Congress is a coordinate branch of the Federal Government. The members of its majority party are members of the administration and not merely its satellites. Members are, as a rule, good sportsmen, and while they fight hard for their ideas or opinions they usually play with their team or party and vote with their own organization. Otherwise the party system is destroyed and we would be governed by blocs as in France.

In a Congress like the present one, elected because of the overwhelming confidence of the people of the country in an outstanding President, there are necessarily many inexperienced men in the majority, and the effectiveness of the minority is lessened because it has been deprived of many of its wisest and most experienced legislators. In the history of our country such leaders as the President have only appeared at great crises. Inexperienced legislators frequently feel lured at the orderly procedure provided by the rules, customs, and precedents of the House and Senate. Some such men frequently will attempt to have bills or procedures adopted which are not acceptable to the principles and practices of the party controlling the administration. Unfortunately, such proceedings are too frequently assisted by the minority, which at such times forgets its principles in a perfectly human but quite childish desire to bring the party in control at that particular time into ridicule or contempt. These temporary upsets are seized upon by the sensational press; people who do not know frequently find themselves confused by what they read in the press commentaries from Washington.

Revolutionists and agitators have had but little influence on the orderly course of events in the Congress. Temporarily they may make nuisances of themselves. The sane and sensible members of both parties hold them in contempt, even when they use them temporarily; and while they may confuse the public, they rarely seriously affect legislation or history.

No man who is familiar with the procedures and precedents of the Federal Congress can ever feel any doubt about either its capacity or its integrity in protecting the best interests of all the people.

I brought this to your attention at some length in an attempt to indicate to you the futility of sending form telegrams asking Members to vote for or against this or that bill. Such telegrams are solicited and encouraged by the professional lobbyists for special interests and blocs and by the employees of the telegraph companies, and they come to the influential Members of the House and Senate by the hundreds or even thousands. The Members return an equally meaningless form reply, send such letters and telegrams off in bundles to the committee considering that

particular legislation, and eventually they arrive at the special Committee on the Disposition of Useless Executive Papers, having exercised practically no influence on the sane and serious Members of the Congress.

Reasonable and reasoning telegrams and letters, pointed and brief as the particular subject will permit, addressed to Congressmen and Senators personally, are highly valued, always receive a courteous reply, and are seriously considered. Resolutions by learned societies or legislatures are printed in the Record; the thought or thoughtlessness which usually characterizes them is recognized. They are referred to the appropriate committees, and that is that. Fortunately for our country Congress is moved more by reason than by emotion, and it would be well for all of our citizens if they knew it and helped to secure wise legislation more by reason and less by pressure.

AIR DEFENSE FOR AMERICA—OUTLINE OF COMPLETE PROGRAM FOR AIR DEFENSE FOR AMERICA AND FOR PRESERVATION OF WORLD PEACE

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the subject of pending legislation affecting proper defense of the Nation by air power.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that most forward-looking, disinterested students of national defense for the United States now regard aircraft as "the first line of defense." Whether that air power be based directly upon land, or be based upon floating surface craft, such as aircraft carriers, it is nevertheless "air power", and wherever that "air power" is exerted it constitutes "the first line of defense."

Armies can only defend against invasion by other armies operating upon the ground. Naval fleets can only defend us against other naval fleets operating upon the sea. But these two agencies leave us undefended as against attack and invasion by the "upper flank." This "upper flank" consists of 10 miles depth of air and more, and includes a ring around the United States 10,000 miles long. Every mile of altitude and every mile of length constitutes a possible "port of entry" for invasion by air, and thus there are as many as one hundred thousand points of attack by air, one hundred thousand "ports of entry" for invasion by air. This means, to the mind which faces the facts as they are, and as they are sure to be tomorrow, that we must increase our capacity to defend America against air attack. We must not only increase aircraft in numbers and in performance, but we must increase personnel to direct such increased number of aircraft. In air fighting the personality of the individual is the greatest single factor. Leadership in ground fighting and in sea fighting is very important. But in air fighting every pilot must largely be his own leader. He must have within himself the will to conquer. He must possess the willingness to dare and to do and to die, out in the lonely air, away from the inspiration of comrades, away from the bugle blast, away from the waving flag, away from the cheers of his companions, away from the newspaper reporters and photographers to record his heroic deeds. In the council chambers of his own soul the air fighter must hold his rendezvous with death and face that issue alone and upon his decision will depend our defense. He, therefore, must be trained and disciplined to meet that test and to resolve that issue in favor of his country and even against his own life.

The size of our earth shrinks as air power increases. The oceans grow narrower as the range of aircraft widens.

Mr. Speaker, the world is now only one-tenth the size it was before the Wright brothers invented the flying machine. Furthermore, development of aircraft in speed, in range, in load-carrying capacity, and in other fighting qualities, will certainly reduce still further the size of the world. Only about 100 years ago that "wet ditch", the English Channel, about 30 miles wide, was an insuperable barrier to Napoleon's ambitious schemes to defeat and humble England. Today who will dare say, in the face of the fighting and bombing aircraft known even now, that America is secure from invasion and attack by air power, even with 3,000 miles of water on her east and 8,000 miles of water on her west? We need not think that other nations will not use air power in any

way that it can be used in order to accomplish their will and to defeat an enemy. We would do it if we got into war, and they will do it.

When war comes all conventions, all treaties, and all so-called "rules of civilized warfare" will crush and crumble like sand cakes. Undoubtedly, in the next war nations possessing sufficient air power will bomb great centers of population and great centers of industrial activity. Undoubtedly in such cases thousands, and maybe hundreds of thousands, of unarmed and defenseless men and women, being citizens of a nation at war, will be killed or wounded or poisoned from the air. There is no such thing as a "gentlemen's war." If we do not wish to suffer such horrors, then we must keep out of war. We cannot keep out of war by merely wishing to do so. We can only keep out of war by being prepared to prevent invasion and to punish the invader. We can do this only by having adequate and ample air power consisting of aircraft and trained fighters to employ at once such aircraft.

In America only a war of defense is possible. Whoever will not defend America should not live in America.

Mr. Speaker, some well-meaning and good-intentioned people insist on saying that "preparation for war brings on war." That may be true with regard to certain nations, depending upon their situation, and national needs, and their governmental structure. But it cannot be true with America. We have all the wealth that we need and ought to have. We have all the room for expansion that we need. We do not covet the land or the wealth of any other government. Our people are peace-minded. Our people "govern their Government." Our people elect their own Representatives—and elect them frequently—to the Congress. War cannot commence and cannot continue without the consent of Congress. Unless the people want war, there will be no war. The only war that the American people want will be a war of defense. If other nations think that we cannot defend ourselves, they will attack us. If they know we are prepared to defend ourselves, they will not attack us. Therefore, to be prepared is for America to preserve the peace for herself, and if she is powerful in the air, upon the sea, and upon the land, her voice will be great in the councils of the nations, to preserve the peace of the entire world.

Our own good will is no defense. Our own desire for peace will not preserve peace. We must be prepared to defend our peace.

Mr. Speaker, some say that no nation will ever attack us. There is no basis in history or human nature or in current events for any such statement or belief. Unfortunately the lessons of history and the signs of the times are to the contrary. There is but one answer to that situation, and it is that we must be ready to drive off an invader so that a potential invader may know that we are ready and he will therefore not commence invasion. Weakness will invite invasion. Strength will prevent invasion. Do other nations love us? Do other nations owe us no great sums of money? Do other nations not envy and covet our great wealth? Do other nations propose to keep their solemn covenants "to keep the peace"? Do other nations combine and recombine to crush a common enemy? Let all our people who read and think and face the facts of human life as they are and not as we would like them to be answer these questions.

But let me ask a few more questions. Do our own people wish to see our citizens and our industrial centers bombed from the air and destroyed? Do our own people want to see great numbers of men and women and children killed and wounded and poisoned by explosives and gas? Do our own people not realize that human nature has not changed in the last 20 years? Do our own people not realize that human nature has changed very little during the course of recorded history? Can our own people hope for any sudden change in the hearts of men? Suppose the tables were turned. Suppose our own population were overcrowded, and suppose our own natural resources were exhausted, and suppose that millions of our own people were constantly upon the verge of starvation. Suppose we owed great debts to some other nation, and suppose we thought that nation a great Shylock who would grind our own people still fur-

ther into the depths of despair, force more millions of our own people to the verge of starvation, and restrain their natural impulse for expansion and for a better chance in the world. What would our people feel and how would they act?

Let history answer this question. How did we feel in 1775 when some little stamp taxes and tea taxes were imposed upon about 2,000,000 colonists who had barely tapped the rich resources of this great continent? How did the young Republic in 1812 feel when the powerful British Empire seized a few American sailors here and there? How did our people of the Southern States feel in 1861 when their leaders told them that their institutions and their property rights and their constitutional rights might be impaired by a fanatical majority? How did our people feel in 1898 when the operations of the Spanish monarchy cried to Heaven from the throats of the suffering Cubans? How did our people feel in 1917 when the then greatest military powers of history denied our rights to travel the high seas and to trade with other nations? Yes; let history answer these questions, and her answer will be that the American people have always said that there are some things dearer than life itself. The answer will be that the American people have a conviction of national dignity, and of social justice, and of governmental righteousness, and that to make these ideals real and effective the American people will, as they always have heretofore been, be willing to sacrifice and to fight and to suffer and to die.

The wisdom of Washington and of his every successor in the White House urging adequate defense must not be discounted.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if this be true of the American people, and who will deny it, then may it not also be true of other peoples? May not other peoples begin to think of America as a Shylock in spite of our generosity and liberality? May not other people think that we have denied their equality, and have sought to repress their natural impulse for expansion? May not other people think that we denied them "a place in the sun", and that we as a great Colossus are bestriding the narrow channels of development for other nations? May not other people think that we have more than our proper share of the wealth of the world, and that we ought to divide up with them, just as some people think that we ought to divide up among ourselves? May not other nations think that by making combinations against us they can eventually crush our power, and compel us to pay tribute, and compel us to cancel our obligations, and compel us to share our blessings?

Let history answer these questions, and when these questions are answered men will realize that George Washington, and every successor of his in the White House, was right when he said that this Nation must be prepared to defend herself. Every President that ever sat in the White House realized that a nation must have adequate arms for defense and an adequate force of trained men ever ready to employ defensive weapons. A broad and comprehensive view of the history of the world and of the philosophy of evolution teaches us that just as the individual must defend his own life and the life of his family and defend the habitation where he and his family sleep against the lawless members of society, so must the Nation be prepared to defend itself against the lawless, selfish, ambitious nations which would seek to invade and to conquer such other nation.

Men are still sinful and selfish. There often have been, and may yet often be, righteous wars. The nation which will not fight in self-defense does not deserve to live.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, if all men everywhere in the world were controlled in their thinking and in their feeling and in their action by the principles of the meek and lowly Nazarene, as enunciated in the Sermon on the Mount, then all nations could disarm. But I believe that even the Prince of Peace believed in the exercise of force for a righteous cause. I believe that when he drove the money changers from the temple by the use of physical power he taught the lesson of a righteous war. I believe that for a man to defend himself and to defend his family and to defend his home against

enemies and criminals meets the approval of a just God. I believe that for a nation to defend itself, and even to be the champion of weak nations and of just international principles, meets the approval of God. I believe that wars of righteousness and of justice have played an important part in the progress and development of the world. Even the World War, with all the horrors and sufferers that have followed in its wake, did set free hundreds of millions of human beings from the shackles of hereditary tyranny and of iron-bound tradition and made them the masters of their own destinies. Whether they exercised that mastery wisely or unwisely is beside the mark now. If they have acted unwisely, they still have freedom of action and may ultimately act wisely.

European critics of the early American Republic said that our democracy could never succeed. They said that the American institutions would fail. They said that the people would prove incapable of self-government. While we have made some mistakes, we have also made great progress, and as a result of the American Republic the eyes of the people of all nations have been turning toward a better and a brighter and a freer and a happier day. Therefore, let America defend herself, let her increase social justice within her own borders, let her develop her own resources, let her people become more enlightened, and thus by their example lead all the nations of the earth along the road of righteousness and social justice unto the final day of peace. But America cannot do these grand and noble things unless she preserves her independence and her integrity and her honor. If America must pay tribute to other nations, if she must divide her wealth, if she must be humbled, if she must surrender her independence, at least in part, then her power to bless her own people, and to set a good example to other nations, is lost. We believe, therefore, that it is the course of wisdom, as outlined by every President and every responsible statesman that knew his history and knew human nature, for us to be prepared to defend ourselves, and to repel invasion, and that such state of preparedness will preserve the peace. Any other course would be to invite invasion and destruction. Thus, the virtue of courage preserves all other virtues.

A PROGRAM FOR AIR DEFENSE

Mr. Speaker, I propose to the Congress and to the country a consistent and coherent program of expansion and development for the air power of the United States. That program proposes to enlist the individual initiative, the inventive genius, and the scientific skill of every person in America, however humble and obscure or however powerful and widely known. That program has four stages. These four stages deal, respectively, with personnel in the air forces, the reserves for the replacement of the air forces, the organization of the junior air reserve, and a new program of development and improvement under the general head of procurement.

THE HUMAN FACTOR ALL-IMPORTANT IN AVIATION

The most important factor in any air force is the human factor. Just as the man behind the gun is more important than the gun, so the man in the plane, guiding, controlling, and operating the plane and its gun, is more important than the plane and the gun put together. The pilots must have nerves of steel that flash and scintillate like diamonds themselves. To encourage the personnel of the Air Corps, I have proposed by H. R. 4351 to set up for the Air Corps a separate promotion list. Just as there is a separate promotion list for the Marine Corps in the Navy, so there ought to be a separate promotion list for the Air Corps, even so long as it remains attached to and a part of the Army.

There is a different principle involved in the personnel of the flying forces from that in the ground forces. Discipline for an air officer is a different thing from discipline for a ground officer. Esprit de corps, morale, loyalty to the high command, and all of those factors going to make up a strong and coherent military organization have different forms and are to be interpreted in different terms when applied to the men who fight in the air. That is why there should be a separate promotion list. The provision for temporary promotions in the Air Corps is not entirely satisfactory. It

ought not to be indefinitely continued. As long as the officer personnel of the Air Corps remains on the promotion list of the Army generally, there is no escape from the occasional use of temporary rank. But with a separate and independent promotion list such temporary rank could be immediately discontinued.

ORGANIZED RESERVES ESSENTIAL TO PROPER DEFENSE BY AIR POWER, AS ALSO BY GROUND TROOPS

It is impossible for any part of the Regular Army, or the Regular Army as a whole, to contemplate the continuation of a system without the aid of numerous reserves. Our Nation cannot and should not maintain a standing Army large enough to do all of its fighting. It is estimated that for two field armies it will be necessary to call into active service at least 120,000 Reserve officers.

Thus the Reserve officers in time of anything like a major war will outnumber the Regular Army officers 10 to 1. That is why every encouragement must be given to the Organized Reserves and toward every factor going into the development and improvement of the Organized Reserves. That is why I have introduced and am enthusiastic for H. R. 4348, which proposes to reorganize the Air Reserve and to provide for its proper supplies, equipment, and training. That is why I am enthusiastic for H. R. 6250, introduced by my friend the Honorable R. EWING THOMASON, of Texas; and I was glad to write the report favoring that bill. By it we not only propose to fill up the authorized strength of the Army Air Corps by adding about 381 additional officers now holding Reserve commissions and graduates of our Air Corps training center, but we also propose to call to active duty for 1 year each 2,000 Reserve officers of the lower grades. Many of these 2,000 Reserve officers will doubtless be flying officers. At the end of 5 years we will have by this program 10,000 well-trained junior officers that can be relied on for instant service in the event of an emergency. Also, that is why I am earnestly advocating the establishment in the War Department of a Reserve division as proposed by H. R. 6674. It appeared by the testimony that 78 percent of the fighting personnel, in the event of a major emergency, would be Reserve officers. Surely that large a component of our fighting forces is entitled to have every reasonable and proper encouragement.

JUNIOR AIR RESERVE—THIS WILL BE A HUGE RESERVOIR FROM WHICH TO DRAW PILOTS IN A WAR EMERGENCY

I am respectfully and earnestly inviting the attention of the Congress and the country to H. R. 4336. This proposes to set up the Junior Air Reserve and to authorize its encouragement by every reasonable means, but without involving any appreciable expense to the Treasury. I will briefly explain the purposes of this bill. It is intended that young men between the ages of 18 and 21 shall be trained, but at their own expense, under general regulations promulgated by the War Department. It is contemplated that the Secretary of War may detail Regular Army officers to assist in the instruction, and certain aircraft and accessories may be used to assist in their training. But it is expected that they will pay those schools and instructors engaged in the business of teaching civilians to fly. It is contemplated that the War Department will make regulations concerning the uniform and insignia of those taking training to be known as "cadets of the Junior Air Reserve." After these cadets have finished their course of instruction and training, they are to be declared members of the Junior Air Reserve, and will be entitled to wear a prescribed uniform and insignia. Of course, they must buy the uniform themselves, though it is expected that the Government will furnish the insignia to insure uniformity. I believe from much conversation and correspondence that I have had with those conducting flying schools and from hundreds of young men who have written me, that there will be annually as many as 10,000 or more young men in America to take this course of training.

For example, a young man still in college, during the vacation after his freshman year, or after his sophomore year, may take a 3 months' course in the ground work, requiring a thorough knowledge of the elementary principles of aerodynamics and of the construction of the aircraft itself.

Then 1 year thereafter the same young man can take another 3 months' course in flying, and if he has the aptitude at the end of the second 3 months' course, being 6 months in all, he should be able to graduate and thus return to his college work wearing a snappy uniform with attractive insignia, all of which will make him proud of his accomplishments, and will inspire thousands of other young men to take the same sort of training during the next summer. These young men upon arriving at 21 years of age will already be in fine condition to take a course of instruction in military aviation. Their previous training will shorten their period of instruction. Most of them will be about ready for the advanced courses given at Kelly Field. Thus the burden upon the Government of 6 months' training at Randolph Field will be lightened. Thus the Regular Army will be receiving the choice material from all over the Nation. Furthermore, those who cannot enter our Air Corps training center for further instruction will seek Reserve commissions through the regular Air Reserves and doubtless most of them can be so commissioned. If this course of conduct be carried out for a very few years there should be annually made available for our Air Reserves somewhere between five and ten thousand fine young men who, after a short course in military aviation, would be prepared to join in the defense of the Nation. Air fighting is a young man's fight. Aviation is a young man's game. The sooner we take these young men under our guidance and encourage them to fly, the better it will be for national defense. This program of organizing the Junior Air Reserve fits in happily with the organization known as the "Junior Birdmen of America."

I commend the Honorable William Randolph Hearst for his vision and constructive statesmanship in organizing this fine body of youngsters. With the instruction that they obtain in the organization of Junior Birdmen of America they will be well prepared to begin the work of cadets in the Junior Air Reserve. Thus, the purposes and training are connected and continuous.

FRONTIER AIR DEFENSE BASES

The next step in the program of national defense by air power is the establishment of a number of frontier air defense bases, and that is why I am sponsoring most enthusiastically H. R. 6621. If that bill is enacted into law, it will permit the establishment at strategic points in the United States and Alaska and others of several possessions of properly equipped air defense bases. It also contemplates the establishment of reserve bases where construction, repair, and maintenance of aircraft may be readily had, and where munitions may be prepared and stored. Undoubtedly there is a great need for these air defense bases. Furthermore, there is great need for a very large number of landing fields in every part of the country. Every airport of landing field is a potential factor in our national defense. Such landing fields should be provided so that if our air forces are moving in large numbers from one part of the country to the other to meet a threatened invasion, it may be possible for any particular aircraft to find safe landing in the event of any mechanical trouble. I am confidently expecting that this legislation will soon be enacted into law and that construction work may be begun at an early date.

AMENDMENT TO PROCUREMENT LAW—ENCOURAGEMENT TO INVENTORS AND ENGINEERS

Next I call your attention to the provisions of H. R. 6810. This bill has to do with the encouragement of every person in America who can contribute to the development of the science and the art of aviation. We remember that the Wright brothers, who invented the first flying machine, were operating a small bicycle-repair shop as a means of living. We remember that some of the greatest inventors that the world has ever known came from the humblest origins. While great laboratories and highly trained scientific staffs of engineers and expert draftsmen are necessary to develop inventions, yet it is a fact that very few of the original inventions came out of these large and expensive engineering and drafting establishments. I have often said that the man who works in the cellar, and the man who works in the attic, the man in the blacksmith's shop, and the man in the cobbler's

shop, ought all to be encouraged to think and to devise ways and means to improve man's mastery over nature. That is why, through H. R. 6810, we are encouraging the inventive genius of America to keep America ahead of the world in the matter of military aviation. That is why we are proposing that aircraft-construction corporations enter into design competitions and into performance competitions. It is but reasonable and natural that the concern which originates a design and which constructs aircraft according to that design is best prepared to improve and develop it. Furthermore, such concern has the greatest pride in improving it and has the greatest financial concern and interest in seeing it improved. Of course, I do not claim that H. R. 6810 is perfect. I am expecting many suggestions from the War Department and the Navy Department and from the public generally, including the leaders in the aircraft industry.

I respectfully invite proposals for amendments from every source, but I do insist that publicity and open competition must prevail at every step in the proceedings. I am bitterly opposed to private negotiations. Private negotiations will undoubtedly mean secret negotiations, and secret negotiations will undoubtedly mean corruption and scandal. Furthermore, secret negotiations will ultimately stagnate progress and prevent the humble and obscure man from having a chance. It will be noted that I do not insist that the cheapest aircraft be always purchased. Such was not the purpose nor the provision of the act of July 2, 1926. That act and the amendment now contemplated by me puts upon the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy the responsibility of deciding openly and publicly which manufacturer is best prepared to serve the interests of the Government. Of course, the interests of the Government involve speed, load-carrying power, range, safety, and price.

Price is one factor, but not the sole factor. If, therefore, one concern is building a better machine than another concern, even though the price be higher, the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy has the power to say that the more expensive aircraft is the one that will be bought. All that I insist upon is that the design competition shall be open to the public after due advertisement. I further insist that the performance competition shall be open to the public after due notice. Then, finally, I insist that the letting of the contract shall be had only after advertisement and after open public competitive bidding. If, after the steps above mentioned, the appropriate Secretary determines that a certain type of aircraft, irrespective of how high the price may be, is the aircraft which the Government needs, then that is the aircraft which the Secretary is authorized to buy.

The right of inspection and of auditing books will protect the Government against unreasonable profit making by the manufacturer. Though the manufacturer may make unexpectedly large profits on one contract, unless he makes the price right on the next lot of planes the Secretary will not give him the contract. Publicity, open competition, letting every concern have a chance to bid and to construct according to contract will cure all ills. The sunlight of publicity will kill the disease germs of corruption. Open competition after due public notice given under the provisions of H. R. 6810 may resolve itself virtually to negotiation, but it will not be private negotiation, it will not be secret negotiation, but it will be open, public negotiation by a responsible contracting officer and those who wish to manufacture and sell to the Government, so that every bidder will know what every other bidder is offering and what price every other is to receive, and the Secretary will assume the responsibility of seeing that one commodity is so much better than another commodity that the Government will buy the particular commodity, even though it be not the cheaper commodity.

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS CONCERNING NATIONAL DEFENSE

Now, in conclusion, I wish to call attention to two matters relating to national defense generally, and not specifically referring to aviation. These are H. R. 5376 and House Joint Resolution 168. The former is one of the legislative proposals contained in the recommendations of the President's Aircraft Board, popularly known as the "Howell Board." This is designed to bring about effective cooperation between

the Army and the Navy. It is designed to put an end to the deadlock existing between the Army and the Navy. It is designed to make the joint board of the Army and the Navy function. It is to give force and vigor to the office of President as Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy. It is to set up the legal machinery whereby the President can function without offending or reflecting upon either member of his Cabinet or either branch of the service. It merely prescribes the machinery whereby the President automatically umpires complications between the Army and the Navy. All of that can be done now, but under existing department organization it is not done. In the opinion of the President's Aircraft Board this thing should be done, and H. R. 5376 will accomplish these results if enacted into law. Furthermore, House Joint Resolution 168 is a fulfillment of a pledge by the Democratic Party expressed in its platform adopted in 1932.

It seems too plain to argue that this going in different directions by the different agencies of national defense ought to stop. I believe that if a joint committee such as is contemplated by House Joint Resolution 168 should study the question, the majority would arrive at the conclusion that our present system is not as efficient as it should be and is unnecessarily expensive. An organization can be set up that will promote efficient work and produce economy. No harm can be done by having such survey as our Democratic Party promised the country. The prediction that the total expenses of the Army and the Navy would soon approximate \$1,000,000,000 a year has already come true. Under existing conditions I do not say that is too much, but I do say that every dollar that can be saved from useless duplication ought to be saved. If efficient work can be promoted, that will indirectly be a saving of money. If we can get the same results by less money, or if we can get greater results from the same money, it will be our duty to the taxpayers to do so. I am respectfully inviting the attention of the Congress and the whole country to this subject and suggestion that we have a survey of all the forces and factors entering into national defense, and that this survey be laid before the President and the Congress after a careful and deliberate study. I would not expect a unanimous report from such commission. We have had too many unanimous reports. We had a unanimous report from the Morrow Board. We had a unanimous report from the Baker Board. We had a unanimous report from the Howell Board. Unanimous reports mean that there have been compromises, and that the whole full truth has not been declared by any one. For example, the Honorable Edward P. Warner frankly and freely declared to the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives that he believed in a single department of national defense. Yet the report of the Howell commission, of which Mr. Warner was a most active and energetic and useful member, did not recommend such a department of national defense.

We would expect from the right sort of commission a vigorous and energetic minority report. Minority opinions of supreme courts, and minority reports of legislative committees, and minority reports of standing commissions are always very helpful. If the majority is right, the minority report will only emphasize the correctness of the majority by contrast. If the majority is wrong, its error ought to be exposed by the minority. Members of a commission, charged with a heavy responsibility, such as an effective program of national defense, ought not to compromise their individual ideas. If there be three or four separate groups in the commission, all the better, for the contrast in such a commission would help in the consideration of the military problems of the air forces, the naval forces and the military forces. It would declare which is the first line of defense, and therefore it should be constantly ready for action. It should declare what strength should be needed for our air force and whether we should have a unified air force or continue as we are with a double-headed, separated air force. Somehow our present organization strikes me as confusing and involving unnecessary expense. Such a commission should fix the place in the defense scheme of floating craft, such as battleships. Such a commission should advise us

as to the necessary strength of the Regular Army. Such a commission should advise us as to the strength and training of all of our reserves. Out of all this there should result something like a well-planned program for all-round national defense. Such a program should be based upon a sound philosophy of national defense. Unless we do resort to some single standard and predicate our organization upon some coherent plan, then we are all striking out in different directions, with different objectives, according to different standards, duplicating our several efforts, and heading toward confusion, chaos, and terrible losses in the event of war.

I think we need a single mind, such as the Secretary of a department of national defense, to preside over all of the defense forces of the Nation. Such a secretary would be a deputy Commander in Chief under the President. He would not be the special pleader for the Army, nor for the Navy, nor for the Air Corps. He would be the arbiter and the umpire between all these interests. He would be prepared to advise the President upon every problem connected with national defense. Undoubtedly the President would pick a man with broad experience, of unusual intelligence, and executive capacity. Such a secretary should be well grounded in history, and especially in the history of military strategy. Such a secretary should thoroughly understand our economic system, should know our industrial and natural resources, and should be in sympathy with all the ideals of the American people. Only a war of defense is justified, but when defense is necessary, all men will stand ready to unite to defend the territory, the integrity, the national rights, and the honor of the American Nation. Such a secretary would be the exponent of the attitude of practically all American citizens that we shall never engage in war upon foreign soil again, that our Nation is to defend our own land and our own rights, and that we should be adequately prepared to defend our rights against the invasion of any other nation or several nations combined. No nation would deliberately begin a hopeless war. They know that we have the man power and the resources, and if they see that we have the organization and the fighting equipment, they will let us alone. Thus, such a secretary would personify the principle that to be ready adequately to defend our Nation would be not only the best way but the only way to preserve peace. If peace is preserved in America because of the strength of our organized armed forces, then it will be a powerful factor in preserving the peace of the world. But the first duty of America is to America. To defend our own land and to defend our own rights and to defend our own honor is not only our God-given right but our God-given duty. When we perform this duty we will be preserving the peace of this Nation and contributing largely to preserving the peace of the whole world.

SOLDIER'S ADJUSTED-COMPENSATION CERTIFICATES

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the immediate payment of the ex-service men's adjusted-compensation certificates by the passage of legislation that will provide a feasible and practical plan for discharging this obligation to the ex-service men, definitely assumed by our Government in an act of Congress when the original bill became a law.

I have included herewith copy of a letter addressed to Senator BORAH and myself, which explains the situation with reference to this legislation:

KANSAS CITY, MO., March 11, 1935.

HON. WILLIAM E. BORAH,

United States Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: As the senior Senator of your State, I am addressing you concerning the pending legislation on the so-called "bonus bill." I am also sending a copy of this letter to the senior Member of the House of Representatives of your State concerning the American Legion's attitude on the proposition. As a member of the Legion and other veteran organizations, I try to keep posted on veteran legislation. You are well informed about these things,

and will remember when the Legion could get no one else to fight the "bonus" battle, PATMAN was the principal leader for the Legion's program, especially while Brother VINSON was taking a vacation from Washington by reason of the Hoover landslide in 1928.

We all know that PATMAN's program has always been to pay the so-called "bonus" in greenbacks. The bankers had scouts at all State conventions, and their ear to the ground at the Miami convention. Being well advised that said convention was going to recommend the "bonus" be paid, the bankers, realizing they would not get any "gravy" if the "bonus" was paid PATMAN's way, they proceeded to engineer and manipulate a banker into national commandship, and that he, the national commander, would fight for a bond issue so that the bankers would get their interest from said issue.

The word "inflation" is nothing but a Wall Street bugaboo; the only time that bugaboo is trotted out is when the idea of paying the bonus with greenbacks is mentioned.

You know better than I do that President Roosevelt in a very recent press conference of March 6 and today stated that "the dollar has not been brought to a proper relation with private debt, and that no attempt should now be made to stabilize domestic commodity prices." In other words, we get the picture that the administration expects to order a further devaluation of the dollar in order to boost prices. The bonus inflation is a small potato compared with the President's inflation program. The well-posted and wide-awake person knows that potential inflation already exists through the devaluation of the gold value of the dollar and the huge increase in surplus bank reserves; that we will have further inflation by reason of the proposed new banking act, which I understand most likely will pass.

To pass the Vinson bill would only encourage more money lying idle in banks, the bankers refusing to loan same for private industry, being satisfied with merely clipping coupons from the bonus issue.

Commander Belgrano made an asinine statement before the House committee wherein he states, "It was not his job to consider comparative costs, but simply work for payment of the certificates." We all know that a man of Belgrano's position should consider the cost of any piece of legislation, and try to have legislation enacted and paid for as cheaply as possible.

It seems to be the consensus of opinion by monetary experts in most trade journals that not only domestic but international inflation is at hand. This is evidenced also by the steady weakness of British currency, which is bound to reflect on the dollar.

In my humble opinion, I sincerely believe that you should vote for the Patman bill.

Yours very truly,

LEO A. SPALDING.

In conclusion let me state that it is my opinion that the passage of the Patman bill, providing for the payment of these certificates by moderately controlled expansion of the currency, backed by the gold and silver reserves in the Treasury, is the only feasible means we have at this time of meeting this Government obligation to the ex-service men.

THE FACTS ABOUT RECLAMATION

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, on the 28th day of February, when the appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior was pending before the House, I told the gentleman from Washington [Mr. ZIONCHECK] that I would later present in detail the facts concerning the financial condition of the projects which the hearings showed were paid 100 percent. I have endeavored to do this, and it has been a laborious undertaking.

May I say that the tables printed on page 2681 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 27, 1935, with relation to reclamation projects are quite obviously intended to mislead Congress, the public, and taxpayers whose funds are being dissipated. The tables are presented ostensibly for the purpose of showing whether or not the money expended by the Government is being repaid and to what extent.

The tables are more eloquent for what they do not show than for what they reveal. One table purports to show what construction charges have been paid when due. An important omission—which, of course, was intentional—is that there is nothing to show that during the last 5 years no construction charges have been payable, because Congress has very generously passed laws exempting the projects from payment of construction charges during the years 1931, 1932, 1933, and 1934. Another bill is now pending to relieve them of payment during 1935. Perhaps when this bill is up for

action the statements concerning the prosperous condition of projects and their excellent record for payments will be somewhat different. It will be interesting to see what representations will then be made regarding their soundness and the eagerness of the landowners to pay.

When no charges whatever are payable because of the 5-year moratorium, it is easy enough to make a good showing. Even 100 percent of nothing is not very much. It is still nothing, even in the synthetic figures of the Reclamation Bureau.

The table shows nothing of the tremendous amounts that were charged off as a total loss to the Government under the act of Congress of May 25, 1926, and the additional charges indefinitely suspended, which, of course, is equivalent to a further loss. These figures aggregate about \$28,000,000. Other acts of Congress have authorized further adjustments on various projects, among which may be mentioned the Okanogan project in Washington, the Milk River project in Montana, the Klamath project in Oregon, and others. It is difficult to compile a complete list or to give the exact amounts because of the incomplete information given in the official reports. I believe it is safe to state that the additional amount will be not less than \$10,000,000. This makes a total loss to the Government of some \$38,000,000. There will in all likelihood be considerably more.

In addition to the charge-offs and suspensions, various acts of Congress provide that charges in arrears and long past due, as they were on most projects, could be funded by being merged with charges later to become due. In this way naturally delinquent charges were extended by making a new note, so to speak. But certainly this does not constitute payment, as is intended to be implied. The record of payment is not good; it only looks and sounds good because of the looseness of Congress in not requiring payments when they could have been made, and because of the trick bookkeeping methods and lack of frankness in presenting the facts.

Since 1920 and even during the most prosperous years known to agriculture there has been a continuous series of acts of Congress giving extensions, granting suspensions, and otherwise forgiving payments which should and could have been made according to the contracts of the landowners. The following is only a partial list picked out from an examination by no means exhaustive. There are no doubt many others, but the following are illustrative: Acts of March 31, 1922; February 28, 1923; December 5, 1924; May 10, 1926; May 25, 1926; May 25, 1928; May 28, 1928; April 23, 1930; April 1, 1932; June 23, 1932; March 3, 1933; June 14, 1933. An additional act was passed in 1934 extending the moratorium on payment of construction charges for 1935.

There is this further factor to be remembered: The original Reclamation Act of 1902 required the Government's investment to be returned in 10 years. In 1914 the time for payment was extended to 20 years. In 1924 the time for payment was further extended to provide for payment on the basis of 5 percent of the crop returns. Under this act the time for repayment varies from 40 years to 100 years or more, depending upon the crop returns, which, of course, vary. An important thing to keep in mind is that no interest is required to be paid on any of these charges. No such liberal terms have ever been granted by a paternalistic government to any group or body of favored citizens. This is a thing well worth remembering by other borrowers who are required to pay interest and to repay the principal in much shorter times. These same borrowers and other taxpayers contribute funds which are loaned without interest and on the ridiculous terms stated to subsidize projects to aggregate the crop surplus and compete with farmers not so subsidized. And this at a time when huge sums of money are being expended to take land out of production. This is not only illogical; it is most inequitable and unjust to the farmers in my State and other States east and west.

These preliminary statements are made to show the general background as an aid to Members who are not familiar with conditions and to whom the picture attempted to be

presented looks not unfavorable particularly when viewed from the standpoint of those sponsoring irrigation. It is apparent that many Members even from the western States are not familiar with many phases of importance. This is probably true of most of us. Quite naturally the unfavorable aspects are not given the air by Dr. Mead and his cohorts. They want more and bigger projects, regardless of what the results are. The new projects now being undertaken and advocated are vastly more expensive than the earlier ones. The charges to be paid by the landowners (presumably) are in many cases several times those payable by the old projects, and these were far too great, according to representations made upon which write-offs were based. How, then, can it be expected that the new projects will be able to and will pay? Of course, the answer is they will not pay. When the money is spent and the proper time rolls around the western Members will be here urging further charge-offs, suspensions, and so forth, just as they have done in the past. It may be said this is but a prediction. This is true; but there is no reason to believe otherwise in view of the extremely high cost. This will be a good thing to be remembered by those Members now here, some of whom no doubt will still be here when the pleas for write-offs come, as they will.

The tables presented do not show the six projects that have been abandoned as complete failures. These projects are as follows: Hondo, in New Mexico; Garden City, in Kansas; Buford-Trenton, N. Dak.; Williston, N. Dak.; King Hill, in Idaho; Umatilla, in Oregon.

The annual report of the Secretary of the Interior for 1934 shows only the first four as being abandoned. These are shown on page 50 of that report. As a matter of fact, however, the King Hill and Umatilla projects have likewise been abandoned. There can be no dispute about this. The printed table shows only the King Hill and Umatilla projects. On examination of this table one would conclude that all is well with these two projects. The table admits this, and on page 2683 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD there is printed a statement alleged to have been made by Senator POPE, of Idaho, at the reclamation conference in Salt Lake. Senator POPE, no doubt, got his data from the Reclamation Bureau, but he should be at least familiar with the King Hill project in his own State. He must or should know that this project has never paid one cent on the construction cost of about \$2,000,000. This project is a complete dud, but there is nothing in any of the statements made to indicate that. It was abandoned by the Government several years ago and no efforts whatever are being made to collect any charges against it. Yet it appears on the table. But does the table show the percentage in the column "Percent repaid of charges due"? Oh, no. It shows no figures, though quite obviously there should be shown the figure zero, for that is exactly what the project has paid of the \$2,000,000 cost. To have shown this figure, however, would not have looked good for that particular project, and it, in addition, would have caused a considerable evaporation in the general average shown at the foot of the table.

The annual report of Secretary Ickes shows the construction cost of the King Hill project to be \$1,905,918, and the report shows also a deficit in operation and maintenance of \$110,122.51. See page 50. This appears to indicate that the project not only paid nothing on construction, but that it did not pay all of its operating cost. This has caused a loss to the Government of more than \$2,000,000. This very pertinent fact is not mentioned by Senator POPE, nor is it shown in the tables or accompanying data. Senator POPE mentions the payment of some \$48,000,000 by all projects, which he says makes them 99.3 percent pure. He makes no mention of the almost equal loss to the Government because of the charge-offs, suspensions, and so forth. The Senator no doubt took the figures as given to him without knowing of or analyzing the other most pertinent facts here stated.

The operation and maintenance table shows the Umatilla project to be 100 percent paid. Excellent if true. The fact is, however, that the Government has not operated this

project for many, many years. It was turned over to the water users in disgust. How, then, could there be any operation and maintenance charges to pay the Government? If no expenditures have been incurred by the Government, of course the project's account in this regard is O. K., but how about the deficit in operation and maintenance incurred by the Government before the project was given over to the landowner? This has been already mentioned and is shown in Secretary Ickes' annual report. Probably this has evaporated in the very arid climate of Oregon.

The crowning joke in the reclamation tables is that most of the projects listed in the operation and maintenance table with a 100-percent record are not operated by the Government and have not been so operated for many years. Among those not operated, the following are mentioned: The Salt River project, the Grand Valley project, the Uncompahgre project, the King Hill project, the lower Yellowstone project, the North Platte project, the Newlands project, the Umatilla project, the Salt Lake Basin project, the Strawberry Valley project, the Okanogan project, and the Shoshone project.

Why are the projects mentioned listed in the table with a 100-percent record generally? Well, the reason probably is that the more projects that are included with a perfect record the better the showing. The Government has no charges to collect, and does this little chore 100 percent. Who could do better? This is somewhat like the good record the farmer makes when he is paid by the Government for not raising wheat or other crops. In those cases his record is likely to be good. One hundred percent looks and sounds good, but when it develops that it is 100 percent of nothing at all the record is not so impressive. It cannot be said that the table was submitted by the Reclamation Bureau for the purpose of giving Congress, the public, and the taxpayers, whose money is being squandered, a frank and true picture of the situation.

Many of the reports of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Secretary of the Interior are conflicting and contradictory. It is extremely difficult for one not familiar with all of the conditions to study and analyze these reports. It is difficult enough when the complicated material is presented with clarity. It is still more difficult when the facts are suppressed and distorted for a specific purpose and when the reports show on their face conflicts and contradictions. One example of an outright conflict, discovered by accident in trying to secure needed information, is found in the Secretary's annual report on page 48 under the heading "Loss: Impairment of funds." There is one item shown as "Charge-offs, act of May 25, 1926, \$14,643,981.16." What purports to be exactly the same time, but with supporting details shown, is found on page 50 of the same report. Here, however, the amount is shown to be \$13,886,989.75. Note the refinement in including the 16 cents in the first instance. This indicates an apparent attempt to show a definite, precise amount, yet there is a difference of almost \$1,000,000. Why worry, then, about the 16 cents! By some strange coincidence the same figures appear on both pages stated for "abandoned projects." These figures are \$1,346,244.64, but quite obviously they are not correct and cannot include the King Hill project, with a cost of some \$2,000,000, and the Umatilla project with a cost of about \$5,000,000, if the annual report is to be taken as correct.

It may be that the two projects last named have been abandoned without authority of Congress and are not included for that reason, but the Hondo project in New Mexico is included in the list, and I have been unable to find any record indicating that Congress has authorized its abandonment. It appears to have been considered necessary, at least in some cases, to secure the consent of Congress for abandonment of a project. This raises the interesting and important question of by what authority the King Hill, the Hondo, and the Umatilla projects have been abandoned.

In the discussion some days ago reference was made to the Okanogan project in Washington. The gentleman from Washington appeared to consider this a very wonderful proj-

ect. This has awakened my further interest and I have looked into the records. Let us see what they show. The Secretary's report, to which I have already referred, shows the cost of this project to have been \$1,452,129.45. Of this amount it is shown that the act of May 25, 1926, authorized a charge-off of \$998,729.20. This is considerably more than one-half of the cost. But were they content with this? Oh, no; not at all. I find that by the act of May 25, 1928, all the remainder of the cost except \$310,000 was likewise permitted to be charged off and the landowners were given 31 years in which to pay this amount. The upshot is that they pay, or agree to pay, less than one-fourth of the cost of the project. Not so good as shown by the trick tables. These tables show that on June 30, 1934, the project was delinquent to the tune of \$38,271.23. The annual charges to be paid amount to only \$10,000. The amount uncollected of amount due, as shown in the table, therefore appears to represent charges for approximately 4 years.

It would be interesting to have the gentleman from Washington advise why the extremely small charge for such a wonderful project should be allowed to run and become delinquent for 4 years, as appears to have been the case if the records are to be credited. The act of Congress just mentioned provides that "the Secretary of the Interior is directed to assume control and shut off water to enforce payment whenever any such annual installment is not paid on or before March 1 after due." If the table is to be relied upon and the charges are due and unpaid, it is plain that the Secretary of the Interior has disregarded the explicit direction of Congress. And what about the great reclamationist, Elwood Mead? Has he been so feverishly busy working up new projects that he has paid no attention to the old ones? He is a wonderful builder and theorizer. His record indicates that few if any of his theories work out, but when they collapse he very adroitly diverts attention elsewhere by exploiting and publicizing something new that promises great results. His projects invariably look much better in the blueprints than on the ground. The blueprints, prepared, of course, by someone else, usually look very attractive.

If the Reclamation Bureau wishes to be fair with Congress, why prepare and present tables concealing and distorting the true facts in the way that has been unquestionably done? This betrays Members of Congress, as in the case of Senator POPE, into making statements which cannot be borne out by the facts or which at least are lacking in frankness.

Secretary Ickes, in an article appearing some time ago in *Colliers*, makes a desperate effort to leave the impression with the public that irrigation projects are financed from the reclamation fund, raised from the resources of the western States. He says that the pockets of the farmers and others in the East are not being picked to construct irrigation and power projects. This article probably should have appeared under the name of Elwood Mead. The Secretary, in what he describes as a frank statement, has permitted his ghost writer to lead him astray in certain aspects, while in others perhaps poetic license is invoked, as I believe he recently remarked about some other matters. The Secretary, Administrator, and so forth, ad lib., knows very well that all of the allotments made from P. W. A. funds come from the Treasury. The reclamation fund has nothing to do with the case. Even the old projects—a fact which probably Secretary Ickes does not know—have been partly constructed with funds from the Treasury and not by any means from the reclamation fund. The Secretary's own report for 1934 shows on page 48 that under the act of June 25, 1910—please note the early date—a loan was made by the Treasury to the reclamation fund of \$20,000,000. A further Treasury loan was made, or at least authorized and presumably made, by the act of March 4, 1931, of \$5,000,000. This makes a total of \$25,000,000 from the Treasury. The Secretary's report shows that \$10,000,000 of this amount has been repaid after some 25 years, it appears, but \$15,000,000 seems to be still in arrears. The legislation shows that these loans were made for the completion only of projects injudiciously undertaken

when sufficient funds were not in the reclamation fund and on which work would have to be discontinued but for the loans. Following the usual reclamation custom, extension after extension has been granted by Congress on the return of these funds to the Treasury. So just how accurate and frank is the Secretary when he strives to leave the impression that the Treasury and the taxpayers are not affected by the program?

Besides, taking the history of reclamation as it has been written, how can anyone expect or believe that the funds allotted from P. W. A. appropriations will be returned to the Treasury in full? Everyone who is familiar with conditions expects huge losses to occur. But "Honest Harold" says these projects are carefully planned, while he implies that the former ones were not. The *Engineering-News Record*, in an article appearing in the November 29, 1934, issue, analyzes most of the new projects and styles them political and geographical, without planning. This journal says that the Grand Coulee Dam is just \$63,000,000 worth of dam, without planning. It is not an irrigation dam, and it is shown that there is no market for the power to be generated. Of course, in the beginning, it would not be admitted that this was anything other than a power dam because of the prejudice against irrigating 1,200,000 or more of new land not needed. Now, however, the view seems to be that this may, after all, be an irrigation dam or the makings of one. This may be another fiction to ease the pressure from the Northwest. They really should find out about it before it is finished. It might prove to be like some of the war-time sweaters which turned out to be something different.

It is also stated by "Honest Harold" that the reclamation law requires projects to be self-liquidating and that contracts must be made for payment of costs. The implication plainly is that he is following the reclamation law. But let us see about that. Certainly this is not true as to the source of the funds. They do not come from the reclamation fund. So far as it can be ascertained, after diligent investigation, no contracts have been secured for repayment of costs of the Grand Coulee Dam or the Casper Alcova projects, except for a very small part of the latter. No contracts for the sale of power have been made, although the Secretary in his article states that the Casper Alcova project is being built because of the "clamorous demand" for power. It is a deep mystery by whom such clamor is made or indeed to whom the power when generated will be sold. But, taking the word of the Secretary that there is a clamor, why has he not made contracts for its sale as in the case of Boulder Dam under the requirement of Congress. The *Engineering-News Record* in editorials has denounced this project as utterly unsound, stating among other things, that there is no market in sight for the power. The people whose money is being spent are entitled to an explanation as to why no contracts have been made insuring at least to some extent the return of the funds in view of the clamorous demand for the power.

In discussing the Shoshone project in Wyoming some days ago I gave from memory certain figures which, upon examination of the records, I find to be inaccurate in some details. These I wish to correct.

In the first place, my estimation of the cost of this project was far too low. I was under the impression that the cost was something like \$6,000,000, but the Secretary's report shows it to have been \$10,014,847.13. Do not forget the 13 cents. Of this amount \$1,544,771.05, it seems, has been charged off as a loss under the act of May 25, 1926. This figure does not agree with the act of Congress making the charge-off. The act states the amount as \$1,677,630, but it appears that some provision is made for adjustment. A very large amount is authorized to be suspended, which is equal to a further loss. The exact amount of the suspensions is not shown by the reports, but they are undoubtedly large, even after allowing for shrinkage in the synthetic book-keeping methods of the Reclamation Bureau. These figures do not include charge-offs, suspensions, and so forth, on the Willwood division of the project. These will come later in

due course, probably along with additional losses on the other divisions. It would not be proper to press for them now until more money has been spent in Wyoming. There is time and place for everything.

The gentleman from Wyoming some days ago questioned my figures, given from memory and in general discussion, concerning the land cultivated. The gentleman was under the impression that practically all of the land on the Garland division was cultivated and producing, and that the other sections were not far different. Both the gentleman's estimate and my own appear to be somewhat inaccurate, according to the records I have. The Secretary's annual report shows that in the Garland division there are 41,649 acres of irrigable land, and that only 30,144 acres are cultivated. This is about one-fourth, or 11,000 acres, out of cultivation. On the Frannie division the record is better if the reports are correct. There the irrigable land consists of 13,220, and 13,094 acres are cultivated. In view of this fact, it is hard to understand why this division should have been given a moratorium of 15 years, during which period they are to pay nothing on construction charge. I have been able to find no record of such a moratorium being authorized, but I am under the impression that a former Member of Congress, who was in a position to be advised of details, informed me that such was the case. I may be wrong about this, but if so should be glad to be correctly advised. On the Willwood division the record is even worse than stated by me from memory. I stated that about one-half of the area was not cultivated. The records show that there are 11,689 acres in the division, of which only 4,296 acres, or considerably less than one-half, are cultivated.

An attempt is made to justify the Casper-Alcova project on the ground that additional land is much needed in Wyoming to produce local feed for cattle carried on the ranges. The records show that on the Riverton project, which was constructed at a cost of around \$4,000,000—Secretary's report—there are 32,000 acres of irrigable land, while only 4,184, or only about one-eighth, is settled and cultivated. On this project, therefore, there are some 28,000 acres of idle land. This, with the idle land on the Shoshone project, which is said to be so good, but which is not borne out by the records, makes a total of around 50,000 acres of vacant and idle land that could be used for raising the much-needed feed for range cattle and for other purposes. These projects are in this condition after many years of efforts to secure settlers. It is an act of folly, therefore, to expend millions more of the people's money to build the Casper-Alcova project. If there is any logic or so-called "planning" in this, I am unable to discern it.

Great emphasis is placed upon the claim that Wyoming has contributed some \$40,000,000—the amount seems to vary with who is telling the story—to the Government's revenues in the way of oil royalties, and it is claimed this money properly belongs to the citizens of Wyoming and should be expended there. Some days ago I expressed the view on the question of whether or not this money belonged to Wyoming because raised there. I do not agree with the theory. But taking the figures as correct, that is, the \$40,000,000, it is shown by the records that the Reclamation Bureau has spent in the State of Wyoming for irrigation already more than \$20,000,000, and after the expenditures of \$22,000,000, or \$27,000,000, whichever of the constantly changing figures proves to be correct, Wyoming will have overdrawn her account. Should all the money derived from Wyoming be spent there, what would happen to the other States of the West in which there is no oil development and which have contributed very little or nothing to the reclamation fund? Would these States subscribe to the theory advanced by Wyoming? The reclamation law as originally drawn was amended to get away from the very thing Wyoming is now advocating.

Of the \$20,000,000 spent on projects in Wyoming, the records show, if my understanding of them is correct, that only about \$800,000 has been repaid. The Shoshone project has been completed 15 or 20 years, and the Riverton project has

also been completed for several years. If it requires 15 or 20 years to collect \$800,000 of the \$20,000,000 expended, at the same rate it would require some 300 or 400 years to collect the Government's investment. Of course, some of the amount has been already charged off and will never be collected. I think anyone would be very brash even to hazard an estimate as to when the \$22,000,000 or \$27,000,000 to be expended on the Casper-Alcova project will be repaid, if ever. At the present rate of payment it would take at least 500 years.

The foregoing facts and figures demonstrate that the record of reclamation from the economic standpoint is extremely bad and, in my judgment, effectually discredits such Government activity.

May I state to the House that since my remarks on this subject became public I received a number of letters from western farmers complaining bitterly of new lands being put in work. A notable illustration of this is a letter sent to Mr. Fred Brenckman, representative of the National Grange at Washington, D. C., from a resident of the State of Washington. This letter recites that the orchard property in the Wenatchee-Okanogan district showed an average fixed indebtedness, not including current indebtedness for growing costs, per acre of \$599.74. A similar tabulation from the files of the Yakima Production Credit Corporation on 238 growers operating 6,402 acres showed \$238.69 per acre, and on 91 growers, as taken from the files of the same credit corporation, an average of \$438.46 per acre. This writer goes on to say:

This information should be of value to you in your efforts to prevent further irrigation development in the State of Washington. The placing of more lands under irrigation at this time is nothing short of confiscation of the homes and ranches of those people who have already invested their life savings in this State.

I am personally in receipt of another letter from Kennewick, Wash., from a well-informed writer, who states in regard to the people going on these lands:

If we gain a bunch of suckers you lose them and they move out here, and the subsequent disillusionment puts them on the bum for good. You had a plain case of that in the ill-starred Brooklyn caravan when they trekked to Idaho. In our whole national set-up there is no one scandal as rotten as the reclamation delusion. I have been hoping that grandma Mead would fall off some high place or that something would happen to this old maniac, but nothing ever does. The pitiful feature of this whole mess is that the western irrigation farmer is never allowed to "catch up." If the poor fool imagines that he sees daylight a long way ahead his hopes are dashed by a new political ditch (appropriation grab) starting up somewhere. Our "wreckclamation service" should be in the Agriculture Department, not the Interior Department.

During the debate in the House I had a discussion with the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. HILL] as to how the Washington State Grange stood on this proposition. In reading the reports and hearings on this question, I had found that the Washington State Grange was opposed to the Grand Coulee development.

The gentleman from Washington was in part right about this matter, but I am in receipt of a letter which would seem to prove that the change of mind on the part of the former master of the Washington State Grange was not without consideration. A prominent resident of Shelton, Mason County, Wash., gives me the details as to this change of heart. The letter in part states:

In fairness to you, allow me to state the facts: The State Grange of Washington were opposed to the Columbia River development. * * * The State master, A. S. Goss, who is now a commissioner in the Farm Credit Administration (by the way, a Republican) wrote several articles and talked against the development of the project. All at once he switched and went over to the side of Senator C. C. Dill, who was for the project. It is a peculiar fact that as soon as the Democrats got in office Senator Dill recommended this A. S. Goss, a Republican, to a very high office at a very good salary, and he is holding it down. This in spite of the fact that he does not know any more about farming than Mrs. Astor's billy goat. Figure it out for yourself. KNUTE HILL and MARION ZIONCHECK are both friends of mine, but I should like you to know the true facts of the case.

The originals of the foregoing letters are in my possession. I will be glad to show them to anyone who is interested.

CROPS GROWN ON RECLAIMED LANDS

The House and the country have been lulled into neutrality by the claim often advanced that the crops grown on reclaimed lands are but 1 percent of national production. My friends from the reclamation States will say that the Government has no control over private enterprise that has entered this field. This is true from a legislative standpoint, but the fact is that the Bureau of Reclamation has had its finger in every one of these projects. It has fostered and encouraged them. In a recent report it takes under serious advisement the proposition of taking over certain private projects. Not one of these private projects but would have died aborning if the Reclamation Service had declared them uneconomical or impractical. This group, whom I definitely charge with destroying the American farmer, East and West, has been the power on the throne and behind the throne in the promotion of these projects.

I have been unable to get a table of the production on irrigated land later than 1929. This type of census is taken every 5 years and the results of the 1934 census have not yet been tabulated. I am including herewith the 1929 table, showing the relative importance of crops grown under irrigation and the ratio value of the part of each crop grown on irrigated lands to the total value of that crop for the United States for the year 1929. This production includes both Government and private reclamation.

Crop	Value of irrigated crops	Acreage of irrigated crops—percentage of United States total of the specified crops	Total value of crop for the United States	Percentage relation of value of irrigated crops to total value for the same crops for the United States
Total.....	\$899,942,549	4.0	\$8,077,812,320	11.1
Cereals (including corn, rye, barley, oats).....	94,057,264	1.6	3,170,691,603	3.0
Other grain and seeds.....	43,777,658	5.2	234,194,340	18.7
Hay crops.....	169,163,452	10.4	988,436,875	17.1
Silage and miscellaneous forage crops.....	3,740,885	1.1	196,883,541	1.9
Root crops for forage.....	74,784	9.0	885,220	8.4
Vegetables ¹	138,809,727	12.2	1,004,568,393	13.8
Planted sugar crops.....	42,678,942	46.9	86,903,003	49.1
Other crops.....	68,480,808	1.9	1,739,542,956	3.9
Small fruits.....	6,305,508	5.3	63,810,720	9.9
Orchard fruits.....	111,113,718		299,049,812	37.2
Grapes.....	37,351,036		56,168,987	66.5
Subtropical fruits.....	172,184,856		217,446,880	79.2
Nuts.....	12,203,911		19,229,990	63.5

¹ Including potatoes (white) and sweetpotatoes and yams.

In conclusion, let me state that I am speaking for the farmer both East and West. I speak for an American agriculture that is cruelly out of economic balance by reason of overproduction. I hold no brief for the land sharks, boomers, railroad officials, pseudo-empire builders, and similar groups who are the driving force in this "reclamation folly." For the sincere and able men in the House who are for this proposition I have no criticism or comment, except to warn them that the day of wrath with its unhappy political results will soon be at hand unless they mend their ways and protect their constituents who are already on the land by opposing further reclamation.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM (H. DOC. NO. 143)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State showing all receipts and disbursements on account of refunds, allowances, and annuities for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1934, in connection with the Foreign Service re-

tirement and disability system, as required by section 26 (a) of an act for the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America, and providing compensation therefor, approved February 23, 1931.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 22, 1935.

(Enclosure: Report concerning retirement and disability fund, Foreign Service.)

STANDARDS OF IDENTITY AND QUALITY OF FOODS AND DRUGS (H. DOC. NO. 142)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following further message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Every enterprise in the United States should be able to adhere to the simple principle of honesty without fear of penalty on that account. Honesty ought to be the best policy not only for one individual, or one enterprise, but for every individual and every enterprise in the Nation. In one field of endeavor there is an obvious means to this end which has been too long neglected: The setting up and careful enforcement of standards of identity and quality for the foods we eat and the drugs we use, together with the strict exclusion from our markets of harmful or adulterated products.

The honor of the producers in a country ought to be the invariable ingredient of the products produced in it. The various qualities of goods require a kind of discrimination which is not at the command of consumers. They are likely to confuse outward appearance with inward integrity. In such a situation as has grown up through our rising level of living and our multiplication of goods, consumers are prevented from choosing intelligently and producers are handicapped in any attempt to maintain higher standards. Only the scientific and disinterested activity of Government can protect this honor of our producers and provide the possibility of discriminating choice to our consumers.

These principles have long been those on which we have founded public policy. But we have fallen behind in their practical application. No comprehensive attempt at reform in the regulation of commerce in food and drugs has been made since 1906. I need not point out to you how much has happened since that time in the invention of new things and their general adoption, as well as in the increase of advertising appeals. Because of these changes loopholes have appeared in the old law which have made abuses easy.

It is time to make practical improvements. A measure is needed which will extend the controls formerly applicable only to labels to advertising also, which will extend protection to the trade in cosmetics; which will provide for a co-operative method of setting standards and for a system of inspection and enforcement to reassure consumers grown hesitant and doubtful; and which will provide for a necessary flexibility in administration as products and conditions change.

I understand this subject has been studied and discussed for the last 2 years and that full information is in the possession of the Congress.

No honest enterpriser need fear that because of the passage of such a measure he will be unfairly treated. He would be asked to do no more than he now holds himself out to do. It would merely make certain that those who are less scrupulous than I know most of our producers to be, cannot force their more honest competitors into dishonorable ways.

The great majority of those engaged in the trade in food and drugs do not need regulation. They observe the spirit as well as the letter of existing law. Present legislation ought to be directed primarily toward a small minority of evaders and chisellers. At the same time even-handed regulation will not only outlaw the bad practices of the few but will also protect the many from unscrupulous competition.

It will, besides, provide a bulwark of consumer confidence throughout the business world.

It is my hope that such legislation may be enacted at this session of the Congress.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 22, 1935.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. GREENWOOD, for 1 week, on account of urgent business.

To Mr. KLEBERG, indefinitely, on account of important business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the House, in accordance with its previous order, adjourned to meet on Monday, March 25, 1935, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. HOUSTON: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. H. R. 6654. A bill to increase the White House Police Force, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 464). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 6141. A bill transferring certain national-forest lands to the Zuni Indian Reservation, N. Mex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 470). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 6236. A bill to authorize the creation of an Indian village within the Shoalwater Indian Reservation, Wash., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 471). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. AYERS: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 6365. A bill extending the time for repayment of the revolving fund for the benefit of the Crow Indians; without amendment (Rept. No. 472). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 6542. A bill to define the exterior boundaries of the Navajo Indian Reservation in New Mexico, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 473). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 6771. A bill to authorize an appropriation to carry out the provisions of the act of May 3, 1928 (45 Stat. L. 484); without amendment (Rept. No. 474). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. HARTER: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 347. An act for the relief of James J. Jordan; without amendment (Rept. No. 463). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6661. A bill for the relief of Maj. Joseph H. Hickey; without amendment (Rept. No. 475). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. AYERS: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 6433. A bill for the relief of certain Indians of the Flathead Reservation killed or injured en route to dedication ceremonies of the Going-to-the-Sun Highway, Glacier National Park; without amendment (Rept. No. 476). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6840) granting a pension to Elizabeth W. Steele, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDRESEN: A bill (H. R. 6952) to facilitate the acquisition of migratory-bird refuges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6953) to provide for the construction of a post-office building in Wabasha, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BREWSTER: A bill (H. R. 6954) to authorize the transfer of the Green Lake Fish Cultural Station in Hancock County, Maine, as an addition to Acadia National Park; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DEEN: A bill (H. R. 6955) to provide for the cooperation by the Federal Government with the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia in meeting the crisis in education; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 6956) to impose an excise tax on butter imported from foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 6957) to provide for filling vacancies in the grade of second lieutenant in the Regular Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6958) relating to the appointment of cadets at the United States Military Academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 6959) to authorize aid to the public schools and other educational institutions of the United States and to aid in relieving unemployment in the several States and the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6960) to authorize the further improvement of rural post roads and to aid in relieving unemployment throughout the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 6961) to amend the Revenue Act of 1932, by imposing an excise tax on tapioca, sago, and cassava; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 6962) to amend an act entitled "An act to accept the cession by the State of Oregon of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Crater Lake National Park, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma (by departmental request): A bill (H. R. 6963) to amend an act entitled "An act setting aside Rice Lake and contiguous lands in Minnesota for the exclusive use and benefit of the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota", approved June 23, 1926, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GASQUE: A bill (H. R. 6964) for the erection of a public building at Lake City, S. C., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. O'CONNOR: Resolution (H. Res. 172) amending rule XXIV of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, requesting that the name of Vancouver Barracks be changed to Fort Vancouver; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Puerto Rico, requesting an investigation of the Puerto Rican

Emergency Relief Administration; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, regarding the Hayden highway amendment to House Joint Resolution 117; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLEY of New York: A bill (H. R. 6965) for the relief of the General Baking Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COLE of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 6966) for the relief of Howard Wayne Thorn; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 6967) granting an increase of pension to Mary Laura Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DELANEY: A bill (H. R. 6968) to place George K. Shuler on the retired list of the United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DEMPSEY: A bill (H. R. 6969) for the relief of Russell J. Vaughan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 6970) for the relief of John B. Canter; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'CONNOR: A bill (H. R. 6971) for the relief of Carl Rasmussen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 6972) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Duff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 6973) granting relief to Daisy B. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEAVER: A bill (H. R. 6974) granting a pension to Ellen F. Colt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6975) for the relief of Claude B. Robinson; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of the rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5297. By Mr. BACHARACH: Resolution of the Vineland-Landis Township Chamber of Commerce, Vineland, N. J., requesting the passage of the Frazier-Lemke farm-relief-production bill and the Thomas-Massingale cost-of-production bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5298. By Mr. DARROW: Memorial of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, opposing enactment of House bill 5357, Steagall banking bill, and similar measures; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5299. By Mr. FISH: Petition of 74 citizens of the Twenty-sixth Congressional District, New York, opposing the Wheeler-Rayburn public-utility bills, providing for the abolition of holding companies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5300. Also, petition of 95 citizens of New York, protesting against religious persecutions in Mexico and requesting the recall of the present American Ambassador, Josephus Daniels; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5301. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Memorial of Jack C. Castellaw, of Ennis, and Messrs. S. E. Wood, Jr., Thomas S. Welemm, H. A. Stiles, A. J. Thomas, W. N. Griffith, Weldon Blair, and J. L. Morris, Sr., of Maypearl, Tex., favoring Federal regulation of motor vehicles; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5302. By Mr. KENNEY: Resolution of the Irish-American Club, Inc., of North Bergen, N. J., requesting the Members of the Seventy-fourth Congress and the Members of the United States Senate to enact legislation for the payment of these adjusted-compensation certificates to the World War veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5303. Also, resolution of the Common Council of the Borough of Sayreville, N. J., memorializing the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States to

approve the General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5304. Also, resolution of the New Jersey Brick Manufacturers Association of Sayreville, N. J., protesting against the continuation of National Recovery Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5305. By Mr. LAMNECK: Petition of Mrs. E. G. Gibson, of 379 Linwood Avenue, and other citizens of Columbus, Ohio, urging for the continuation of the Nye munitions investigation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5306. By Mr. MOTT: House Joint Memorial No. 19 of the Thirty-eighth Legislative Assembly of Oregon, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact House Resolution 2024 of the Federal Congress, relating to travel pay for certain troops during the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

5307. By Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Petition headed by M. Rogers, of Charlotte, N. C., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5308. Also, petition headed by M. E. Dalton, of Knoxville, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5309. Also, petition headed by E. Swift, of Chicago, Ill., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5310. Also, petition headed by M. Cook, of Clintwood, Va., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5311. Also, petition headed by M. Plumley, of Trousdale, Okla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5312. Also, petition headed by O. Hayes, of Maypearl, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5313. Also, petition headed by Samuel Roberts, of Maypearl, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5314. Also, petition headed by M. Baskett, of Maypearl, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5315. Also, petition headed by Samuel Nicholson, of Maypearl, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5316. Also, petition headed by E. Andrews, of Maypearl, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5317. Also, petition headed by Frederick Webb, of Maypearl, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5318. Also, petition headed by Alvin Brown, of Cleburne, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5319. Also, petition headed by A. W. Wheeler, of Maypearl, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5320. Also, petition headed by O. Harrison, of Stephen Creek, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5321. Also, petition headed by S. A. Ragsdale, of Logan, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS,

the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5322. Also, petition headed by Y. Anderson, of Chatfield, Minn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5323. Also, petition headed by F. C. Contee, of Sarasota, Fla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5324. Also, petition headed by W. M. Barber, of Crawfordsville, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5325. Also, petition headed by T. A. Teague, of Paris, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5326. Also, petition headed by Z. B. Hardin, of Warnick, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5327. Also, petition headed by Rev. Frank Canty, of Gainesville, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5328. Also, petition headed by M. E. Brownfield, of Cora, Mo., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5329. Also, petition headed by Rev. James E. Lightle, of Johnson City, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5330. Also, petition headed by B. Barkley, of Johnson City, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5331. Also, petition headed by C. Wright, of Princess Anne, Md., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5332. Also, petition headed by L. J. James, of Edna, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5333. Also, petition headed by A. Toodle, of Sherman, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5334. Also, petition headed by Roy Davis, of Grayson County in the State of Texas, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5335. Also, petition headed by James Cochran, of Albright, W. Va., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5336. Also, petition headed by August Bock, of Magnet, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5337. Also, petition headed by I. M. Crews, of Rector, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5338. Also, petition headed by H. Jones, of Shaw, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5339. Also, petition headed by E. Meadows, of Atlanta, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the

Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5340. Also, petition headed by Robert C. Lee, of Tillar, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5341. Also, petition headed by Chester Eads, of Carbon Hill, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5342. Also, petition headed by B. S. McLaurin, of Greenwood, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5343. Also, petition headed by M. Biles, of Big Creek, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5344. Also, petition headed by William Dickson, of Sidon, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5345. Also, petition headed by G. E. McGill, of Greenwood, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5346. Also, petition headed by Fred W. Horn, of Virden, Ill., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5347. Also, petition headed by Henry Crofton, of Elko, S. C., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5348. Also, petition headed by C. Williams, of Memphis, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5349. Also, petition headed by James E. Roderick, of Wilmington, N. C., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5350. Also, petition headed by Raymond Christopher, of Plaquemine, La., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5351. Also, petition headed by P. Monett, of Cloutierville, La., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5352. Also, petition headed by S. E. Hargis, of Texarkana, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5353. Also, petition headed by John T. Byas, of Texarkana, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5354. Also, petition headed by J. R. Sweeney, of Texarkana, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5355. Also, petition headed by E. F. Templeton, of Texarkana, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5356. Also, petition headed by Homer Hilton, of Oconee, Ill., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5357. Also, petition headed by M. Edwards, of Chattanooga, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5358. Also, petition headed by W. S. Vails, of Charlotte, N. C., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5359. Also, petition headed by J. L. McFarland, of Flora, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5360. Also, petition headed by K. Ballard, of Chattanooga, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5361. Also, petition headed by Adam Brown, of Gloria, La., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5362. Also, petition headed by Rev. L. H. Holmes, of Gloria, La., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5363. Also, petition headed by S. Hall, of Ethel, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5364. Also, petition headed by Guy N. Norton, of Kevil, Ky., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5365. Also, petition headed by M. E. Cook, of Vandalia, Ill., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5366. Also, petition headed by R. P. Thompson, of Webster Grove, Mo., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5367. Also, petition headed by George Gunter, of Farmington, Mo., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5368. Also, petition headed by Ben Moore, of Prairie Point, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5369. Also, petition headed by Willis Phasom, of Ramer, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5370. Also, petition headed by J. Dyon, of St. Anne, Ill., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5371. Also, petition headed by J. D. McKinley, of Franklin, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5372. Also, petition headed by A. Williams, of Ramer, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5373. Also, petition headed by M. C. McKinley, of Franklin, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5374. Also, petition headed by E. Rice, of Hulen, Ky., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5375. Also, petition headed by M. Roberson, of Boley, Okla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5376. Also, petition headed by Scott T. Anderson, of Tamo, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS,

the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5377. Also, petition headed by O. Bauldrin, of Groveton, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5378. Also, petition headed by B. A. Russ, of Flintville, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5379. Also, petition headed by J. Y. Delaughter, of Bogue Chitto, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5380. Also, petition headed by J. M. Newman, of Jackson, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5381. Also, petition headed by J. W. Bearden, of Wright City, Okla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5382. Also, petition headed by R. C. Westbrook, of Liberty, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5383. Also, petition headed by R. Williams, of Mobile, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5384. Also, petition headed by Andrew Gregory, of Brinkley, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5385. Also, petition headed by Ambry Wynne, of Fargo, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5386. Also, petition headed by P. R. Campbell, of Birch, N. C., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5387. Also, petition headed by John W. Keenum, of Vests, N. C., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5388. Also, petition headed by L. Westbrook, of Smithdale, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5389. Also, petition headed by W. L. Dobbins, of Yadkinville, N. C., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5390. Also, petition headed by Johnson Drake, of Bowman, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5391. Also, petition headed by W. J. Jones, of Vilonia, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5392. Also, petition headed by C. J. Bearden, of Wright City, Okla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5393. Also, petition headed by K. Chandler, of Blytheville, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5394. Also, petition headed by John Vance, of Ranger, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5395. Also, petition headed by H. C. Subers, of Eastland, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5396. Also, petition headed by B. S. Mathis, of Falcon, N. C., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5397. Also, petition headed by E. R. Cooper, of Dunn, N. C., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5398. Also, petition headed by C. C. Haruss, of Briceville, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5399. Also, petition headed by M. Collins, of Pontotoc, Okla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5400. Also, petition headed by W. E. Bailes, of Seymour, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5401. Also, petition headed by P. Arguello, of Buena Vista, N. Mex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5402. Also, petition headed by Reece B. Monroe, of Wytheville, Va., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5403. Also, petition headed by R. Preyeay, of Nederland, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5404. Also, petition headed by Oscar Bevoit, of Port Neches, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5405. Also, petition headed by E. Dudley, of Wake Forest, N. C., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5406. Also, petition headed by L. V. Swain, of Harlan, Ky., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5407. Also, petition headed by C. R. Strades, of Heiskell, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5408. Also, petition headed by John Gass, of Olyphant, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5409. Also, petition headed by O. D. Phillips, of Hughes, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5410. Also, petition headed by J. S. Skalton, of Hoschton, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5411. Also, petition headed by J. R. Arguello, of Mora, N. Mex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions

of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5412. Also, petition headed by M. Dickerson, of Atlanta, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5413. Also, petition headed by N. Stacker, of Clarksville, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5414. Also, petition headed by S. D. Koonce, of Alamo, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5415. Also, petition headed by Marvin McKinley, of Germantown, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5416. Also, petition headed by L. Norwood, of Brenham, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5417. Also, petition headed by Paul W. Hickman, of Mound City, Ill., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5418. Also, petition headed by E. Little, of Paulette, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5419. Also, petition headed by F. Thornton, of Laurel, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5420. Also, petition headed by N. C. Jorgensen, of Fort Pierce, Fla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5421. Also, petition headed by E. D. Johens, of Mattson, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5422. Also, petition headed by Giles Roetts, of Pine Bluff, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5423. Also, petition headed by L. B. Childress, of Dyersburg, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5424. Also, petition headed by M. McLadden, of Marianna, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5425. Also, petition headed by E. P. Vaughn, of Rome, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5426. Also, petition headed by Elige Retoner, of Chicago, Ill., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5427. Also, petition headed by George Reddy, of Groesbeck, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5428. Also, petition headed by John Yarbrough, of Jackson, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5429. Also, petition headed by Joe C. Adams, of Groesbeck, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5430. Also, petition headed by P. W. Wilson, of Bowling Green, Ky., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5431. Also, petition headed by H. McCloue, of Troy, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5432. Also, petition headed by Richard Mattingly, of McQuady, Ky., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5433. Also, petition headed by C. Blakemore, of Chicago, Ill., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5434. Also, petition headed by M. Jackson, of Donalsonville, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5435. Also, petition headed by C. H. Sampson, of Donalsonville, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5436. Also, petition headed by B. A. Nichold, of Decatur, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5437. By Mr. SISSON: Resolution of the West Hill Parent-Teachers Association, of Ilion, N. Y.; to the Committee on Education.

5438. Also, resolution of the New York Congress of Parents and Teachers, Inc.; to the Committee on Education.

5439. Also, petition of Group No. 2066, Polish National Alliance of the United States of North America, asking that October 11 of each year be set aside as General Pulaski Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5440. Also, petition of Group No. 67, Polish National Alliance of the United States of North America, asking that October 11 of each year be set aside as General Pulaski Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5441. Also, petition of Group No. 2808, Polish National Alliance of the United States of North America, asking that October 11 of each year be set aside as General Pulaski Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5442. Also, petition of Group No. 491 of the Polish National Alliance of the United States of North America, asking that October 11 of each year be set aside as General Pulaski Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5443. Also, petition of John G. Pendorf, of Blossvale, N. Y., and others, protesting against House bill 5423 and Senate bill 1725, known as the "utilities bills"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5444. Also, petition of R. H. Hollister, of West Winfield, N. Y., and others, protesting against House bill 5423 and Senate bill 1725, known as the "utilities bills"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5445. Also, petition of Hon. John D. Buckley, of Utica, N. Y., and others, protesting against conditions existing in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5446. Also, resolution of the members of Central New York Chapter, Knights of Columbus, comprising over 7,000 members, protesting against conditions existing in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5447. Also, petition of Francis E. Horian, of Waterville, N. Y., and others, protesting against House bill 5423 and Senate bill 1725, known as the "utilities bills"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5448. Also, petition of George H. Trinder, of West Winfield, N. Y., and others, protesting against House bill 5423 and Senate bill 1725, known as the "utilities bills"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5449. Also, petition of Robert Thomas, of Waterville, N. Y., and others, protesting against House bill 5423 and Senate bill 1725, known as the "utilities bills"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5450. By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Resolution of the West Virginia Legislature, urging the approval of a national colonial celebration for the purpose of financing the proposed George Washington foundation as a national shrine in West Virginia at the historic town of Bath, Berkeley Springs, for the benefit of mankind; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5451. By Mr. TRUAX: Petition of Anton Blazek Post, No. 2079, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Cleveland, Ohio, consisting of 104 members and an auxiliary of 50 women, by their commander, John Prospal, urging support of Patman bill, for immediate cash payment of adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5452. Also, petition of Earnest D. Watson, commander, and 40 other members of George Selsam Post, No. 1058, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Zanesville, Ohio, urging support of Patman bill, for the immediate cash payment of the adjusted-service certificates without compromise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5453. Also, petition of Mahoning Lodge, No. 86, Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers, Niles, Ohio, urging support of the Wagner labor bill, by their secretary, William J. Webster; to the Committee on Labor.

5454. Also, petition of the Miami Lions Club, and endorsed by the Lions Club of Newburgh, Cleveland, Ohio, by their secretary, Paul E. Carter, requesting the Congress of the United States to accord to copper a measure of protection sufficient to enable the domestic western mines and home owners to realize the proper and consistent benefits of the home market, in order that their homes, their schools, and their communities may be preserved, and that this protection be established by the levy of a tax sufficient to protect the American copper industry and the people who are dependent on this industry for their living; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5455. Also, petition of the Mahoning Veterans' Association, Youngstown, Ohio, by their secretary, Carl E. Rook, endorsing the action of Governor Davey in demanding a fair and impartial investigation of the entire Relief Administration in the State of Ohio, and pledging their support to carry out the thought and purposes of the act which created the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, as they realize the importance of the Relief Administration in the adjustment of economic life of the people and the taxpayers of the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Rules.

5456. By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Petition of Group No. 329, Polish National Alliance of the United States, Brockton, Mass., memorializing Congress to enact House Joint Resolution 81 and Senate Joint Resolution 11, directing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5457. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city of Liberal, Kans.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5458. Also, petition of Andrew Jackson Post, No. 1291, Veterans of Foreign Wars; to the Committee on Pensions.

5459. Also, petition of the city of Parma, Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5460. Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Gallatin, Tenn.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5461. Also, petition of the city of Keokuk, Iowa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

SATURDAY, MARCH 23, 1935

(Legislative day of Wednesday, Mar. 13, 1935)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, March 22, 1935, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.